

WASHINGTON

Kenneth K. King, Addy.
 Hannah L. Parker, Alderwood Manor.
 Ernest H. McComb, Everson.
 John H. McAfee, Ilwaco.
 Mary Mallory, Mansfield.
 Arthur A. Barnes, Pasco.
 Bertha H. Welsh, Prescott.
 Jessie A. Knight, Shelton.
 Richard H. Lee, Wilsoncreek.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, we thank Thee that there is no cry so faint, no cause so weak, and no man so humble as to be beyond divine sympathy. We rejoice that all distinctions are swept away. O welcome those who wish for Thee and live with those who long for Thee. Bless us with the more abundant life which is to heal wounds, lead others to hidden truth, open new realms of thought and new vistas of hope. Subdue in us any arrogant motives of self-interest and fits of temper—they disturb and even defeat our usefulness; they so often dull the finer instincts and crush the more compassionate feelings. Let the streams that flow from the fountains of heavenly grace flood our lives and fructify our minds. In our Savior's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1958) entitled "An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 100]

Andresen	Dickstein	Marshall	Shannon
Bacon	Dorsey	Mitchell, III.	Sisson
Bankhead	Doutrich	Murdock	Smith, Conn.
Brooks	Fish	Oliver	Smith, Va.
Brown, Mich.	Gassaway	Palmisano	Sweeney
Buckley, N. Y.	Gifford	Patman	Tobey
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Patton	Tolan
Cannon, Wis.	Hennings	Perkins	Underwood
Casey	Kopplemann	Pettengill	Whelchel
Celler	Lamneck	Peyser	White
Chapman	Larrabee	Polk	Whittington
Cochran	Lea, Calif.	Richards	Wolcott
Connery	Lewis, Md.	Rogers, N. H.	Wood
Cooper, Ohio	McClellan	Russell	
Dear	McGroarty	Seger	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

SESSION OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit today during the session of the House after half-past 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file several reports from that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SCHUYLER MERRITT

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include therein a citation given to our colleague from Connecticut, SCHUYLER MERRITT, on receiving the degree of LL. D. from Yale University at its two hundred and thirty-fourth commencement at New Haven on June 19. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The citation referred to follows:

SCHUYLER MERRITT, LL. D.

Professor NETTLETON. Dean of the Connecticut Congressional delegation; hardy, and well-nigh perennial. Representative at Washington of the Fourth Connecticut District; even more firmly seated in the constant affection of a constituency which gladly transgresses party law and local limits. Born in New York City, but, after a single experimental year, withdrawing to Connecticut, he made Stamford his immediate home and Yale his future college, graduating in the class of '73, and taking his law degree from Columbia. For 50 years and more he has followed, as he has set, the highest standards of professional and public service, mating knowledge with integrity, and manhood with modesty. At home, administrator of civic charities, schools, and libraries; within the State, member of the convention which importantly revised the constitution, and chairman for 10 years of the Connecticut Board of Education; in Congress, valued member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; ever an active agent of the common weal, fulfilled in the honors of half a century, but pressing forward with unclouded vision and unfaltering energy. It was written of an elder lawgiver who led the people out of the wilderness that, though he long outlived a century, "yet was not his eye dim, nor his natural force abated." May this be the law and the prophets. Quod bonum, felix, faustum, fortunatumque sit.

President ANGELL. Sturdy son of a sturdy stock, you have long and faithfully represented in the Halls of Congress the finest qualities of your native State. Shrewd wisdom, integrity, industry, unflinching honor, and the spirit of fair play—these have ever characterized your varied forms of public service and have justly won for you the admiration of friend and foe alike. Your alma mater, proud of your distinguished record, confers upon you her highest honor, the degree of doctor of laws, admitting you to all its rights and privileges.

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks briefly in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I read in an afternoon newspaper that Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, in his unobtrusive way, is achieving great results in a new field of service with which his name has not heretofore been associated. It seems that this modest, unassuming pioneer of the air is pushing forward toward new frontiers, this time in the field of scientific research, which recalls to my mind a flood of memories of one of the most extraordinary characters of American history.

Eight years ago this month, on his return from his epochal flight to Paris, it was my duty and responsibility, as president of the National Press Club, to introduce him at the Washington Auditorium to what I believe was the largest audience ever assembled under one roof at the Nation's Capital. By unanimous consent of the House, I am going to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech I made on that occasion. It was as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, not for ages has the imagination of man been stirred as it was 3 weeks ago when Charles A. Lindbergh, fired by the intrepid spirit of the Western World, launched forth in his airplane alone, provisioned with four sandwiches and a bottle of water, a pioneer of the trackless seas. As America's shores receded in the distance he faced a vast wilderness of treacherous ocean.

As if rolled by the very boldness of this Columbus of the air—this winged Mercury, speeding like a thunderbolt of Jove—nature sent her tempestuous elements athwart his path, and while he battled with the storm and sleet millions upon millions of his fellow beings sent up prayers for his safety to the throne of God. The 33 hours and 30 minutes from New York to Paris was a period of tragic suspense, when the whole world poured forth in a myriad of mystic ways its admiration for the incomparable aviator and its love for the mother who had brought forth such a boy.

To him mountains of peril were as nothing. His faith was buoyant and his hopes were high. Courage was his woof and fiber, and it is not difficult to imagine that stern fate, surprised by this peremptory challenge of her inexorable decrees, lifted her beetled brows and was touched by the very sublimity of his heroism, for she gave him a sporting chance.

And when he reached the other shores he arose to another test of character as greatly as when he battled with time and the elements.

Amid all of the adulations of kings and parliaments he remained a modest, unassuming American, an honor to his home country, an ambassador of good will, doing more to foster amity between nations than could have been done by a thousand ministers of state.

"After all," he said in London, "two Britishers were the first to fly across the Atlantic." Again, when he learned that Chamberlin had started on the long flight, he remarked fervently, "I hope he makes it." Here he struck the major chord of his character in his desire to give to his comrades at home and across the seas a share of his imperishable glory. And when, in foreign lands, the ties of home began to press and strain against his heart and he confessed, in simple truth and sincerity, to being homesick, how America did yearn to take him to her bosom!

His name is now among the immortals. Around the firesides and in the vast, crowded halls of the future, wherever worth is recognized and genius is extolled, his achievement will be recalled with pride by countless generations yet unborn. Nothing finer could have been done; nothing grander could have been done; no greater epic could have been written into history, and tonight we thank Almighty God that in His infinite goodness and mercy He has permitted Charles A. Lindbergh to return to the arms of those who love him.

I now present Colonel Lindbergh.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has happened during the last 8 eventful years to mar the prophecy which I uttered on that occasion or to shake the Nation's faith in this remarkable young man. Although his life has been seared by one of the cruelest tragedies ever known in all the annals of crime, he goes serenely on trying to do good and seeking by a record of service to justify his existence in a world where there is always so much worth while to be done by those with righteous minds and willing hands.

Mr. Speaker, the news that Colonel Lindbergh is seeking through scientific research to ameliorate the condition of mankind once more stamps him as a man of purpose, as a many-sided genius who is described by his collaborator, Dr. Alexis Carrell, as possessing one of the "keenest and most intuitive and inventive minds." He does not need to do these things to win immortality, for immortality almost beyond comparison is his already. He does them because he loves his fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, since that other June, now rapidly fading into the mists of the past, when the youthful Charles A. Lindbergh returned amid riotous acclaim from Paris to a Nation that for the time had banished every other thought except the thought of throwing her arms around him, I have met him often, under diverse conditions and varying circumstances, and I have never ceased to admire him for his sincerity, for his determination, for his freedom from commercialism, for his altruism which has prompted him to devote his life's efforts to the common good and for the fact that under conditions that would have turned the heads of less well-poised mortals he has always remained a simple, true American, utterly free from affectation, courting no favors from the rich and powerful and standing on the principle that "a man's a man, for a' that", whether that principle be applied to those who dwell in hovels or in palaces. Every time I look at him I say to myself:

He has walked with kings, nor lost the common touch!

RAILROAD REORGANIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 8587, the railroad reorganization bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CLARENCE HERBERT PELTIER

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 669) for the relief of Clarence Herbert Peltier and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes the gentleman will withdraw that request. The Chair will not recognize Members to make speeches until after the Committee on Appropriations has concluded its business.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes the gentleman will withhold that request until after the consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1935

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8554) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1935, and June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8554, with Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933", approved May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 58), including the acquisition of necessary land, the clearing of such land, relocation of highways, and the construction or purchase of transmission lines and other facilities, and all other necessary works authorized by said act, and for printing and binding, law books, books of reference, newspapers, periodicals, purchase, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and all necessary salaries and expenses connected with the organization, operation, and investigations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, \$34,675,192: *Provided*, That this appropriation and all appropriations, allotments, and other funds made available heretofore to the Tennessee Valley Authority, including any unexpended balances remaining from the appropriation of \$50,000,000 made to the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933, the allocation of \$25,000,000 made to the Tennessee Valley Authority under the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources, except as limited by section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act approved May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 58), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority Fund" and shall remain available until June 30, 1936.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLEAN: On page 48, line 16, after the figures "1936", insert the following:

"All moneys of the Corporation of whatsoever nature hereafter received by or for the Corporation shall be immediately and without diminution deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States, and such portion thereof as is authorized by the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, or other law, to be used by said Corporation in carrying out the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be transferred to an appropriate appropriation account, withdrawable only on warrant as are other appropriated public moneys, and subject to authority specifically granted by the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, and as amended, all laws regulating the obligating or expenditure of other public moneys shall be applicable thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall be applicable to purchases of supplies and equipment necessary for dam construction. Accounts of all transactions involv-

ing receipts or disbursements of the Corporation shall be duly rendered to the General Accounting Office at such times and in such substance and form as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, and said accounts and such claims as may arise shall be settled and adjusted by the General Accounting Office under and pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Budget and Accounting Act approved June 10, 1921: *Provided*, That the expenses of such portion of the audit as the Comptroller General may authorize to be done in the field shall be paid from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General. In such connection the Comptroller General and his representatives shall have free and open access to all papers, books, records, files, accounts, plants, warehouses, offices, and all other things, property, and places belonging to, under the control of, or used or employed by the Corporation, and shall be afforded full facilities for counting all cash and verifying transactions with the balances in depositories. The officers of the Corporation to whom moneys may be advanced on accountable warrant shall each give a bond to the United States for the faithful discharge of the duties of his office according to law in such amount as shall be directed by the Comptroller General. Should there be any administrative delinquency in the rendering of the accounts as directed, or any unsatisfactory condition of the accounts, requisitions for funds shall be disapproved by the Comptroller General unless, for good cause shown, he shall elect to withhold such disapproval."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment really changes only to a limited extent the language of the committee amendment by limiting the manner in which the funds of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be spent under the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General; and it makes the money applicable only to such disbursements as are made as a result of competitive bidding and not as a result of negotiated contracts, as has been the practice of the Tennessee Valley Authority. My amendment is purely a limitation on the activities of the agency to which this money is to be given.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. This amendment is not only a limitation upon the funds carried in this bill which are in effect re-appropriated, but it is also germane to the language of the bill covering the full appropriations that have been made for this purpose into one fund. It is, also, a direction as to how and in what manner the funds shall be accounted for.

By the rule under which we are proceeding in the consideration of this bill, anything germane to the language of the bill is made in order, and I believe the gentleman's amendment in its entirety is in order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. In answer to the argument of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I maintain that the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey goes far beyond the effect claimed for it. The amendment changes existing law and is, therefore, legislation on an appropriation bill and entirely out of order, as pointed out by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken. The Chair bases this conclusion upon a ruling handed down by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson], while presiding over a Committee of the Whole. At that time and in a similar case it was held that although the amendment then offered was germane it contained additional legislation beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations.

The Chair believes that this amendment is germane but that it proposes additional legislation which is a subject

matter ordinarily coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 48, line 16, strike out "\$34,675,192" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,675,192"; page 48, line 16, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein or elsewhere made available to the Tennessee Valley Authority or the Tennessee Valley fund shall be used for the construction of any new dam or power lines until further action by Congress."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is additional legislation on an appropriation bill and changes existing law, for it broadens the language of the pending bill by use of the words "or elsewhere."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. I desire to be heard briefly, if the Chair please. The first portion of the amendment to the effect that none of the funds shall be available for the construction of any new dam or power lines until further action by Congress, is purely a limitation and strictly within the Holman rule.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the word "elsewhere" used in the amendment constitutes additional legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, while the amendment is in the form of a limitation, yet the words "or elsewhere" contained in the amendment apply to other appropriations, and is therefore legislation; and for this reason the point of order is sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 48, line 16, strike out "\$34,675,192" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,675,192", and on page 48, line 16, strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following:

"*Provided*, That none of the funds herein made available to the Tennessee Valley Authority or the Tennessee Valley fund shall be used for the construction of any new dam or power lines until further action by Congress."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order before the gentleman argues this matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is out of order because the use of the word "fund" implies funds not carried in the pending bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a further point of order against the amendment before the gentleman from New York begins his argument.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a further point of order against the amendment before any proceedings intervene.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the amendment constitutes a change in existing law unauthorized on an appropriation bill, in that the present law authorizes these funds to build dams.

Mr. RANKIN. And transmission lines.

Mr. BLANTON. And transmission lines. The gentleman's amendment seeks to change existing law, and this cannot be done in an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I notice there is a mistake in the amendment I sent to the Clerk's desk. I intended to say, "On page 48, line 2, strike out '\$34,000,000' and insert '\$28,000,000.'"

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be so modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as requested.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, has the point of order been disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is still pending.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is lodged also against the modified amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. TABER. It changes the line reference; I had the wrong line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment in its present form is a limitation applying solely to funds herein appropriated.

There is absolutely no question but what it is entirely a limitation upon the language that already appears in the bill as read. I can see no reason for sustaining the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair takes the position that the amendment is a limitation; therefore the point of order is overruled.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Tennessee Valley Authority proposes with the funds that are herein made available to start work, as I understand it, upon two dams, known as "Chickamauga" and "Guntersville." These dams are quite expensive propositions. The total cost of these dams when completed, will be \$27,000,000. If we start construction we will have to finish them.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone already ahead and started to build four dams, the Wheeler Dam, the Pickwick Dam, the Norris Dam, and the Wilson Dam. When those dams are completed some kind of a size-up may be then made as to whether there is any possible excuse for more dams. We are also in the process of constructing a lot of power lines. There is now an injunction suit pending to prevent the Tennessee Valley Authority engaging in the power business. Whether or not that will be sustained in the Supreme Court no one knows.

The only possible excuse for these dams is to control the flood situation at Chattanooga.

May I say that Engineering Document No. 328, page 188, shows the flood situation. It is expected that the Norris Dam will cut off a very large portion, if not all, of the flood damage that will accrue to Chattanooga. Personally, I believe it will. Why should we go ahead and appropriate money for more dams until we find out whether it will or not? If we go head and spend \$17,000,000 for the Chickamauga Dam we have that much money invested. There is not navigation enough there to justify such an expenditure. It is not a power proposition, because the Pickwick Dam and the Wheeler Dam are not now equipped with a power house, with generators or with wheels to generate power. The Commission itself, even in the way it is being managed, recognizes that there is not demand enough to justify that sort of thing. Therefore we ought to stop the further construction of power lines or dams until we find out what the situation is going to be. We ought to stop this until we find out whether or not the Chattanooga situation is going to be entirely corrected, because that is the only excuse for the Chickamauga Dam or any of the others.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. We ought to at least make the Tennessee Valley Authority submit a report or give an estimate of what these things are going to cost before they are permitted to go ahead and start construction?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, may I say I think we have a statement from them as to what these dams will cost; but we ought to have a picture of this whole situation, and whether or not it can be made to operate successfully.

According to their own statement, which appears in the RECORD, it will cost at least \$192,000,000 to build the dams which they want to build, and in 1941 the only revenue they expect to receive will be about \$5,000,000, which would not more than half pay the depreciation charges, not alone the interest on the money invested. We are already in this

thing. We have a lot of power available out of the Norris and Wilson Dams to sell. Now, let us find out what the constitutional situation is with reference to the right of the Government to go ahead and sell power. Let us find out what the flood-control situation is going to be before we go ahead and fool away a lot more money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's contention against building these dams is that we do not know the situation in Chattanooga as to the floods and consequently we ought to wait. If you want a picture of the flood situation in Chattanooga during different floods, there it is [displaying a large picture]. Practically all the city was covered with water in 1917. The gentleman from New York knows that the proof produced shows that the building of the Norris Dam will lower the flood stage 6 feet, and that the Chickamauga Dam will lower it 3½ feet. We do not have to wait until my city is swept from the banks of the Tennessee River to have the proper proof of need for protection, and no one on the committee knows the situation better than the gentleman from New York. Here is a picture of flood stage there of 47 feet and 35 feet. You can see the serious troubles we may have by this blue print. We do not have to wait.

Mr. Chairman, this is the usual old cry of the Republican Party in trying to defeat the construction of these dams on the Tennessee River. There is not a dam included in this appropriation which was not approved by the Congress in 1932. I regret the fact that they on the other side are trying to make this a party measure. You know they tried to junk the Wilson Dam because it was named after that great President of the World War, Woodrow Wilson. [Applause.]

We passed bills some two or three times disposing of Muscle Shoals, and the Cove Creek Dam, and it was vetoed by Hoover and by Coolidge. The reason we have authority to construct these dams now is because Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President.

Mr. Chairman, if the Membership votes to amend this appropriation, if they interfere with it in any way, it will be a strike at the administration. I appeal to the Democrats to uphold the Appropriations Committee in passing this appropriation as it is. It has already been cut down from the Budget estimate of \$60,000,000 to \$34,000,000. It provides for the commencement of these two dams, Guntersville and Chickamauga, which are necessary for the navigation of the Tennessee River. It is necessary to control the flood situation existing in my city, and may I say that the average damage to that city, as estimated over a period of years, is \$687,000 per year. Then they tell me to wait to see whether or not we need this dam. I say again that the gentleman from New York knows the situation, because the proof was offered before his committee, and he is thoroughly familiar with the situation. I ask the Democrats to stand by the administration and to stand by these dams that in 1932 were endorsed by the Congress for the improvement of navigation in the Tennessee River, for flood control, and to create power.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Eliminating the problem of flood control, if the Tennessee River is to be made navigable, these dams are necessary?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Absolutely necessary. These dams will make the Tennessee River available for navigation for 71 miles above Chattanooga. There is nothing, in my opinion, that has come before this House with more merit than this item in the pending appropriation bill.

I appeal to you not to let them cut the amount one cent or put one modification upon it. It aids the South, but it aids the entire United States as well. [Applause and cries of "Vote."]

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, we have opposition to this section of the proposed measure from two sources. The first is political in its nature; certain members of the

Republican Party oppose it because the Tennessee Valley Authority is the brain child of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the greatest leader of modern times. The other source of opposition is from the electric utility and coal companies. If we brush aside the curtain of suspicion and misrepresentation we see the directing hand of the utility companies of this country. They read the handwriting on the wall. There has been a great deal of misleading information brought to this House, as well as a distortion of the facts with reference to the aims and purposes of the T. V. A. We have been told it is not necessary to build the Guntersville or the Chickamauga Dams at this time. They overlook the fact that these two dams are primarily for the purpose of developing navigation and to provide flood control. The Army engineers estimate that there is an annual loss from floods of \$1,784,000 each year on the Tennessee River alone. If we consider the loss on the tributaries, the amount will be increased. A total acreage of 666,154 is inundated each year.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. Gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. This is also a most insidious move to try to paralyze the Tennessee Valley Authority by preventing the building of power lines to carry on its work.

Mr. STARNES. Absolutely.

With reference to the question of navigation, the Pickwick Dam, the Wheeler Dam, and the Wilson Dam will bring 9 feet of navigable water to Guntersville, Ala. Guntersville is in the heart of the Tennessee River Valley. Chattanooga and Knoxville and the great industrial area lying back of these cities are approximately 120 and 250 miles to the northeast. It is absolutely essential that the Guntersville Dam be built next in order to open navigation to a 7-foot stage to the city of Chattanooga, Tenn. This dam will also assist in flood control and provisions can be made for developing power when needed.

These two dams are essential to this program, and I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. As a matter of fact, there can be no economic development of this entire project without these two dams.

Mr. STARNES. Absolutely not. This is the heart of the program.

We must not overlook the fact that in addition to the development of navigation the T. V. A. program embraces the prevention of soil erosion, reforestation, the development of cheaper power, the manufacture of cheaper fertilizer, and provisions for the national defense. This program is the most far-reaching plan in the history of this Nation for the betterment of the social and economic condition of the people of this Nation. It is absolutely essential that the T. V. A. have an opportunity to develop the program unhampered by unnecessary litigation, unnecessary political sniping, and legislation which will restrict its operations to a point where the directors cannot function. I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment. [Applause.]

I have unbounded confidence in the ability, honor, and integrity of the directors of the T. V. A. They are men who have a passion for service. Each is an outstanding leader in his particular activity. The plans and aims of the Authority are in line with the legislative will of the Congress as expressed in the original T. V. A. Act.

Members of Congress realize that this is not a local nor a sectional program. The Tennessee Valley covers an area of approximately 42,000 square miles and has a population of two and a quarter million. The area touches upon seven southeastern States. There is a wide variety of natural resources in this region. The T. V. A. proposes to utilize these resources to better the social and economic condition of the people in this region and to demonstrate to the people of the Nation that similar programs can be successful anywhere in our country.

Although this region has a fine native white-stock population and an infinite variety of natural resources and un-

limited power possibilities, private utilities and private industry, of which the opposition so glibly prate, have failed to develop this section and by obstructionist tactics would prevent the proper development of this great region by the T. V. A.

The program of the T. V. A. is essentially a program of utilization and conservation. It is time for the people of this country to realize that in order to continue the march of progress we must utilize our vast natural resources and conserve them for future generations. In this manner, and in this manner only, can we properly fulfill our destiny. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the Military Affairs Committee of the House has been holding hearings on this T. V. A. proposition for over 4 months.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Have they not really been holding an inquisition on the T. V. A.?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I think they have.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I think so, too.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say to the Committee that the early edition of the hearings, which included the testimony given to the House committee during the months of February and March, has been published. The more important and more illuminating hearings by the House Military Affairs Committee were held on this subject during the months of April and May. In accordance with the usual courtesy of a congressional committee, a transcript of these hearings was sent to Messrs. Morgan and Lillenthal over 2 weeks ago for their correction. The bill in its entire form is coming before the House next week, and I believe I am correct when I state that your Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee wired Mr. Lillenthal and Mr. Morgan 2 days ago requesting a return of this transcript so that these hearings may be printed and available to Members when the House bill is considered. I know, as a matter of fact, that at least up to an hour ago the transcript of the hearings had not been received in the Military Affairs Committee, and we had not had even the courtesy of a reply to the request by wire. I here and now call upon Mr. Morgan and Mr. Lillenthal to return the transcript of these hearings by next Monday morning so they may be published by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] that Dr. Morgan will be here next week with this transcript. He is not holding it out. There was so much information called for in the examination of the directors of the T. V. A. that it is taking some time to get it up.

The object of this amendment is to harass the T. V. A. It is an insidious movement on the part of the Power Trust, by indirection, through their friends in Congress, to try to hamper the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority in order that they may not be able to do the very things we provided in the law of 1933. It is an attempt to prevent their building the transmission lines necessary to keep from being bottled up by the Power Trust and to destroy the great work the T. V. A. is now doing.

I have seen what has been going on before this Committee on Military Affairs, and I have seen the outrageous inquisition to which Dr. Morgan has been subjected at the hands of those men who are more in sympathy with the Power Trust than they are with the American people.

I want to take this occasion to say that one of the great men of this Republic, one of the great men of this day, is Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe he is the greatest constructing engineer on this continent.

If Dr. Morgan had been financially minded, he might have become a multimillionaire. He might have gone to England and become a resident there—as another great engineer did. He might have gone to Australia and got rich exploiting the people of Australia. He might have gone

to China and transported Chinese coolies to South Africa to die under the burning rays of an African sun and made a fortune in that way, regardless of the condemnation of the British courts.

He might have become food administrator and come back here heralded as a great humanitarian as well as a great engineer.

He might have become a Republican candidate for President, after he decided which party he belonged to, and been heralded as a great statesman, a high-powered intellect, a superman, and organizing genius, who could put 2 cars in every garage and 2 chickens in every pot. [Laughter and applause.]

After the failure of his administration, he might have been found groveling among the grass roots of the drought-stricken area, seeking for an issue or searching for an alibi. [Applause.]

But Dr. Morgan chose to devote his life to building up America.

If you want to know whether he has been successful, go to the people along the Miami River in Ohio, where formerly thousands of men, women, and children were drowned, and see what this great man has done there in protecting those people from such disasters in the future.

I resent these insinuations against Dr. Morgan by Members of Congress who are more in sympathy with the Power Trust than they are with the American people. I never met a more earnest, firm, patriotic man in my life than Dr. Morgan. He will bring the records here, and when you bring this bill out on the floor of the House the Congress of the United States will be here to take care of it. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be closed in 5 minutes.

Mr. McLEAN. O Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. No unanimous-consent request is pending. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that have been made, I think I am entitled to be heard for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that three Members have spoken against the amendment and two for it, I shall change my motion and move to close debate in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas, that all debate upon this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] I am impelled to take a position on the floor of the House, though I do so most reluctantly, because of the request of my good friend and colleague from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], who is personally interested in one of these dams. For months the House Committee on Military Affairs, which is the legislative committee in the House which has charge of the Tennessee Valley Authority legislation, has been holding hearings, and in those hearings we have had the testimony of all of the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. We have had the testimony of scores of other witnesses in opposition to the proposed amendment to the Tennessee Valley Act. Throughout that whole hearing—and I state this fearlessly of contradiction—there has been a tendency and disposition on the part of the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority to ignore the Congress of the United States and do as they please in the Tennessee Valley. Under the provisions of the original basic act by which the Tennessee Valley Authority was created it was provided that they should report to Congress their conduct, their actions, and their doings in that valley and give a constructive, detailed program of what they were spending and how they proposed to spend it. That they steadfastly refuse to do, and this amendment, if put into this bill, will require them to come to us for money.

So far as the Power Trust is concerned, I made my living, until I came to Congress to starve, largely off the power companies as a prosecutor of litigation against them. I have no interest in them, but I am interested in the great coal industry in this country, that employs thousands of men in my district and hundreds of thousands of others in the States of Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois, and all throughout this country.

We were literally told by Dr. Morgan that the coal industry is doomed in this country; that electricity proposes to take its place; and the situation is this, that you are building a bureau in Tennessee with 2,500 white-collar employees riding around in cars at 7 cents a mile extra over regular salary and per diem; \$140,000 was paid out last year, over and above their daily and monthly wages, for car hire. You are building a bureau with 2,500 white-collar employees in Knoxville, Tenn., bigger than half the departments in Washington, and you propose to turn loose three bureaucrats, dreamers, who believe in the socialistic doctrines of Edward Bellamy, the first great socialist in America, as stated by Dr. Morgan last week in a speech in Knoxville. He said that he visualized a great utopian state, and that it was the T. V. A. plans to establish in the southeastern part of the United States such a state as Edward Bellamy wrote about 50 years ago, and that means communism in its vilest form.

All this amendment proposes to do is to tell them to come to Congress when they want to do something and tell us what it is. Instead of that, they propose to build a string of dams, and they say there ought to be 50 or 60 in the Tennessee Valley that will cost over a billion dollars. All this amendment does is to tell them to work on through the next 2 years on the Norris Dam, which will take a year, when it is done, to fill it up with water; on the Wheeler Dam, that is a year and a half behind; and on the other dam they have started, in which they have just begun their foundation, the Pickwick Dam, before commencing other dams. That is all it means. They are going around the Military Affairs Committee and going into the Appropriations Committee, demanding multiplied millions, and after awhile they will be down at the White House to get another \$100,000,000 out of the \$4,800,000,000 that we handed over to the President to do with as he pleases; and after a while you will have a monster in Tennessee and Alabama that will swallow every right of every one of the States in the South. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I was elected to Congress to take part in its deliberations. I was assigned to a committee of this House, charged with a certain duty, and in the exercise of that duty there developed certain conditions which I considered worthy of attention and which should have investigation. Pursuant to my obligation as a Member of Congress and as a member of that committee, I proceeded to inquire into matters which I believed the country was entitled to know about. I have no feeling of disrespect for Dr. Arthur E. Morgan. On the contrary, I am willing to agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that he is a most distinguished and capable man, but there must be some merit in the opposition which arose against this proposition to have excited so much interest. There is not a man in the Congress who knows the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority. There is no document to which we can refer to ascertain what the Tennessee Valley Authority intends to do. If the Tennessee Valley Authority had, in the exercise of reasonable judgment, made a study of the situation and reported it to Congress, we could have investigated it and looked into it and perhaps have determined upon it as a plan of comprehensive development, and we would know what the ultimate was going to be and how much is going to be spent each year, in an orderly way, just as we do in other matters.

The Tennessee Valley Authority does not intend to let Congress know how far it expects to go. They could not now because they do not know themselves. There must be some merit in this opposition because their budget request

was for \$56,000,000. Later when the opposition started and they looked into the matter they returned to Congress and they said, "We can get along with \$40,000,000." The Committee on Appropriations, after mature deliberation and consideration, has determined that they can get along with \$34,878,000.

What I want is a square deal for American business men, and they are not getting it now in the Tennessee Valley. When a constituent of mine says "I was the lowest bidder for concrete mixers or for equipment that they are using in the Tennessee Valley, and my equipment was all that was required of it, it complied with the specifications, but I did not get the contract; I stayed in Knoxville for 2 weeks waiting to be consulted by representatives of the Tennessee Valley Authority, only to find out on the street that the contract had been awarded to the highest bidder", it is time to look into these things. These men defy the statutes of the United States when it comes to negotiating contracts and granting awards to the highest bidders on contracts. That is an illustration of the kind of thing that we tried to impress upon Dr. Morgan before the committee as being wrong. Those are the things that came to me through correspondence and through the newspapers. I asked Dr. Morgan if they were correct, and we found out that they were. Am I not justified, under those circumstances, in inquiring into them, and on that account and because of that should I be held up to ridicule by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DUNN] yesterday afternoon, prompted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] who sent for the book, and when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] this afternoon inferred that I am a representative of the Power Trust? The people of Union County, N. J., know me. I have no fears for the slurs that are thrown at me in this exercise of my public duty.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. How could the gentleman know I was talking about him when I said "friends of the Power Trust"?

Mr. McLEAN. I know the gentleman's inference. Everybody in the House knew it. But I say to you that though my activities perhaps may have appeared as though I was aligned with the power interests, I have no interest in any Power Trusts. I believe there are things going on in the Tennessee Valley that the American people ought to know about. I say there ought not be another dollar appropriated for this organization until they put their house in order. They have \$10,000,000 to use to finish the work, and they can go ahead and finish their work, and they will have plenty of money to put their house in order and get this thing on an orderly basis. Then they can send a report to Congress and come here and tell us how much it is going to cost and what we are going to ultimately get, and then we will be able to deliberate without all this excitement. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 59 and noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 48, line 2, after the word "Authority", strike out "\$34,675,192" and insert "2 cents."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment is merely dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could not pass on a matter of that kind at this point.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority and all amendments thereto be closed in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I proposed this amendment because I am opposed to the Government in business. I do not believe the Government of the United States should try to pattern after Russia. The administration of Mr. Roosevelt recognized Russia about a year ago, and we are trying to pattern after that nation as much as any nation in the world. It seems to me it is about time the American people woke up and found out that their rights are being taken away from them. It is about time that the American people realized that this administration is putting the Government into business with such rapidity that it will not be long until we will be a socialized nation; that we will be a nation patterned after Russia.

We have heard this called an administration measure, and we have seen it backed by the party. I want to say that the party that is recommending the Government to be in all lines of business, competing with the citizens of its own country, socializing it, robbing it of its taxpayers, robbing the citizens of a right the Constitution gave to them, will soon find out that the day will come in America, and it is not far away, when the people will rise up and put down any party that proposes Russianizing the United States, and it is right that it should.

I just picked out of the newspaper this morning a most interesting statement:

COURT REFUSES TO LET ESTATES BUY UNITED STATES BONDS—PROBATE JUDGE IN ILLINOIS HOLDS RATE IS TOO LOW, NATIONAL DEBT TOO HIGH

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., June 20.—Probate Judge Benjamin S. DeBoice, of Sangamon County, today refused authority to the First State Trust & Savings Bank, as conservator in seven estates, to invest the estate funds in United States Government securities.

The court, in a thousand-word opinion, held that "during this period of business uncertainty and lowering prices the investing public has turned to Government obligations as a cyclone cellar in which to place investments."

Predicting that "we are upon the eve of a period of inflation," Judge Boice held that the trend of prices upon most tangible goods was upward and that real estate prices showed a definite gain. "Today bank reserves are the largest in history and every bank and insurance company in the country is full to overflowing with cash, awaiting the opportunity for investment."

This is worth while for the members of the Democratic Party to hear. The court refused to permit the estate to buy Government bonds because we are spending the taxpayers' money recklessly and are not trying to do anything to increase the revenues or repaying the expenditures. Quite true, the other day the President sent down a message on the subject of increased taxation, but it was the biggest camouflage ever put over on the American people. Why did he not make recommendation for immediate increases of taxes to balance his Budget as he promised the people when he was elected. He is only fooling the people, and you know what they say about that—you can fool all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. And Mr. Roosevelt will be no exception to that.

Read the speech of Lew Douglas, former Director of the Budget for Mr. Roosevelt, at the commencement at Amherst a few days ago, and you will know that the administration fooled him, and he quit Mr. Roosevelt. I think Lew Douglas would be great presidential timber for the Democratic Party. He would fulfill his promises and those of the Democratic Party.

When the situation gets to the point where a judge refuses to permit estates to buy bonds of the Federal Government as an investment for trust funds, the position is very precarious indeed. [Applause.] I say that if this administration recognizes that inheritance taxes should be increased, that the taxes on those who make great incomes

should be increased, you ought to do it and not talk about it, for you cannot increase the national debt any more than it is, and the greatest in history, without endangering our very safety as a Nation. Mr. Roosevelt is the greatest spender of all time, and probably the greatest promiser, but he does not fulfill his promises. We should not appropriate but two cents for T. V. A.—it is unconstitutional—it should die and die now. I hope the amendment does pass.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think we all agree that there are no serious amendments to be offered for consideration during the further reading of the bill; and I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as having been read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, for the Congress, in the consideration of an appropriation bill dealing with large sums of money, to establish the precedent of considering the bill as read would be very bad. The Members should know all there is in the bill. The bill can be read rapidly, and it can be passed in the regular order. I think every dollar appropriated out of the Treasury should be appropriated in a regular, systematic, and considered way.

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For hospital and domiciliary facilities, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount is authorized to be used by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, with the approval of the President, for extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1 and 2 of the act approved March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1550): *Provided further*, That not to exceed 3 percent of this amount shall be available for the employment in the District of Columbia and in the field of necessary technical and clerical assistants at the customary rates of compensation exclusively to aid in the preparation of the plans and specifications for the projects authorized herein and for the supervision of the execution thereof, and for traveling expenses, rentals in the District of Columbia, field-office equipment, and supplies in connection therewith.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a couple of questions with reference to the Veterans' Administration. Is a considerable part of the \$20,000,000 to be used for the care of mental cases?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There are over 11,000 ailing veterans without hospitalization, which number includes 7,000 mental cases.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the chairman know off-hand how the bill affects the situation in Iowa?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; I know only that substantial provision has been made for the Knoxville Hospital. The hospital facilities are to be increased in strategic parts of the country in such way as to accommodate the greatest number of veterans around and near their homes.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the committee is appropriating a large part of this money for the care of mental cases. There has been a serious shortage of facilities for the care of veterans afflicted with mental disabilities in Government hospitals. This has resulted in the assignment of some of them to State insane hospitals, where sometimes the care has not been satisfactory. My opinion has been, and continues to be, that Government

hospitals for veterans should be pretty well confined to mental cases, tubercular cases, and a few other types that require special hospital equipment.

I believe that the majority of veterans' cases could be handled better and with less expense to the Government in the local hospitals. I am sure that it does not contribute to a veteran's comfort nor to his recovery to have him taken away from his home, his family, and his friends to be cared for by total strangers and to encounter the depressing loneliness of a strange city. There are thousands of empty beds in the non-Government hospitals of the country, which, it seems to me, could well be occupied by veterans. In his home-town hospital the veteran would be cared for by a doctor who knows him, waited on by nurses who know him, and visited by his family and his friends. Such surroundings, I am sure, would be much more favorable to the veteran's comfort and recovery than the strange surroundings of a far-away Government hospital.

The local hospitals usually are supported by the donations of public-spirited individuals or by the benevolence of churches. These hospitals need the business. The use of them would assist in their financial support. It surely would be more satisfactory to the veterans, and obviously less expensive to the Government.

I earnestly hope that the proper committee will give serious consideration to a change in our veterans' hospitalization system to the end that: (1) Government hospitals shall be used almost, if not quite, exclusively for mental, tubercular, and other cases requiring special hospital equipment, and that (2) the veteran shall be permitted to receive his treatment at Government expense in his local hospital in all cases where that hospital is properly equipped to care for him.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

Armor, armament, and ammunition: For an additional amount toward the armor, armament, and ammunition for vessels heretofore authorized, and so forth, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1935, \$6,110,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct a question or two to the chairman of the committee. Will the chairman please inform the Committee how much money has already been appropriated to the Navy Department for other naval purposes?

Mr. BUCHANAN. For the next fiscal year?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. \$458,684,379 is the amount in the pending Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And, with the appropriations carried in this deficiency bill, what will the total amount to?

Mr. BUCHANAN. \$20,000,000 more, or \$478,684,379.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts: For construction, remodeling, recondition, and installation at military posts of buildings and appurtenances thereto, including interior facilities, necessary services, roads, connections to water, sewer, gas, and electric mains, and similar improvements with reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1339; title 40, sec. 267), including also the engagement by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), and without regard to the restrictions of existing law governing the employment or compensation of employees of the United States, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of War may determine of the services of architects or firms or corporations thereof and other technical and professional personnel as may be necessary, and including also general overhead expenses of transportation, engineering, supplies, inspection and supervision, travel connected therewith, and such services as may be necessary in the office of the Quartermaster General, to remain available until expended, \$9,850,000 as follows: Toward construction at the United States Military Academy, \$5,324,250; toward construction of an airdrome in Hawaii, \$4,525,750.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask similar questions with reference to the War Department.

Will the chairman please tell us how much has been appropriated heretofore for the War Department for the next fiscal year?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The War Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936 carries \$341,348,204 for military activities and \$60,649,966 for nonmilitary activities, making a total of \$401,998,170.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This carries an additional appropriation of approximately \$20,000,000?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think the gentleman is talking about rivers and harbors and military posts. This deficiency bill carries \$10,000,000 for rivers and harbors and \$9,850,000 for military activities. These sums are additional to the amounts I have just stated.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

May I direct a question to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee? On page 58 the sum of \$5,324,250 is appropriated for construction at the United States Military Academy. Can the chairman tell us whether it is proposed that the Government do this work itself or let it by contract?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Under the language it may be done either way. In some instances a good deal of it may be done by force account. They may have it done either by force account or by contract.

Mr. KENNEY. Has the gentleman considered providing for the prevailing rate of wage in the contracts let to private contractors?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This is done under the prevailing rates of wage.

Mr. KENNEY. The chairman probably knows that Congress last term passed a bill appropriating \$3,300,000,000 for Public Works. Some of that money was by Executive order given over to the Navy Department to be used in building navy vessels—cruisers and, I believe, one or more destroyers. Contracts for their building were let to a shipbuilding company in my State, but there being no provision in the contracts for payment of the prevailing wage scale, a serious strike resulted involving 3,700 workmen, who complained of inordinately low wages, excessive working hours, and unfair working conditions. The strike began May 13 last and still persists. I was wondering whether or not the gentleman has considered the feature of guaranteeing the prevailing rate of wages in all private contracts?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The item the gentleman refers to was under the P. W. A., and when they made those allotments from the \$3,300,000,000 the P. W. A. rate of wage was required to be used in the allotment thus made. That has no application to this appropriation, and no other emergency activity has any relation to it. This is under the regular program of the Government as practiced from year to year.

Mr. KENNEY. May I say to the gentleman that the P. W. A. turned P. W. A. moneys or funds over to the Navy Department? The Navy Department handled the contracts for the building of the ships, and in the contracts made by the Navy Department no provision was made for paying labor prevailing-rate wages.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly; but this is an appropriation made by the Congress, and it is subject to the prevailing rate of wage.

Mr. KENNEY. The gentleman is satisfied as to that?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 43, line 14, for the purpose of offering an amendment to correct a misprint.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 43, line 14, strike out "1934" and insert in lieu thereof "1914."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8554) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1935, and June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, under the resolution (H. Res. 266) he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF FLOODS ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 7349) to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1928, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, 19, 26, 27, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, and 47, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,062,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,020,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$40,732,310"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,590,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18, 28, 42, 44, and 48.

GLOVER H. CARY,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM

(Except as to amendment no. 32),

CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
ROYAL S. COPELAND,
PARK TRAMMELL,
FREDERICK HALE,
HENRY W. KEYES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On amendment no. 1: Increases from \$4,200 to \$9,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount that may be expended upon allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, to civilian employees serving in foreign countries.

On amendments nos. 2, 3, and 4, relating to the appropriation "Miscellaneous expenses": Appropriates \$1,062,700, instead of \$1,055,700, as proposed by the House, and \$1,071,060, as proposed by the Senate, such increase of \$7,000 being intended to make additional amounts available for communication expenses, postage, and clerk hire, all incident to the reopening of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes.

On amendments nos. 5, 6, and 7, relating to the Naval Research Laboratory: Appropriates \$310,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$210,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 8 to 13, both inclusive, relating to the appropriation "Training, education, and welfare, Navy": Appropriates \$115,559, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$103,059, as proposed by the House, for the Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I.; limits expenditures upon post-graduate instruction of prospective or potential Staff Corps officers who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than 3 years, instead of 2 years, as proposed by the House, and 5 years, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$58,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$55,000, as proposed by the House, for libraries incident to the reopening of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes; and appropriates \$282,200, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$279,200, as proposed by the House, for welfare and recreation, also incident to the reopening of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes.

On amendment no. 14: Corrects the text.

On amendments nos. 15, 16, and 17, relating to the Naval Reserve: Limits to 19, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 20, as proposed by the House, the number of Reserve officers (Navy and Marine Corps) above the grade of senior lieutenant of the Navy who may draw the pay and allowances of their grade while in the performance of extended active duty.

On amendment no. 19: Limits the amount that may be expended for pay of masters and instructors in swordsmanship and physical training at the Naval Academy to \$22,800, as proposed by the House, instead of \$25,100, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 20 and 21, relating to the appropriation "Engineering": Appropriates \$19,662,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$19,550,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$112,000 being intended to cover the "engineering" portion of the expense of building a new ferry for use at Newport, R. I.; reappropriates \$500,000 to be applied to the purchase of machine tools, as proposed by the Senate, and increases the limitation of \$1,662,000 proposed by the House upon expenditures for pay of classified employees to \$1,667,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 22 and 23, relating to the appropriation "Construction and repair of vessels": Appropriates \$18,288,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$18,050,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$238,000 being intended to cover all other than the "engineering" expenses of building a new ferry for use at Newport, R. I.; reappropriates \$500,000, to be applied to the

purchase of machine tools, as proposed by the Senate, and increases the limitation of \$1,800,000 proposed by the House upon expenditures for pay of classified employees to \$1,805,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 24: Reappropriates \$500,000 under the Bureau of Ordnance, to be applied to the purchase of machine tools, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 25, 26, 27, and 29, relating to the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy": Corrects the text and fixes the amount allocated for pay of enlisted men, active list, at \$73,872,972, as proposed by the House, instead of \$74,621,779, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 30 and 31, relating to the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts": Appropriates \$8,350,540, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,300,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$50,540 being incident to reopening the naval training station, Great Lakes, and makes a minor textual change.

On amendment no. 32: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the House provision increasing the capital of the naval supply account fund by \$7,500,000 by the reappropriation of unobligated balances of certain prior year appropriations for the purpose of enabling the Navy Department to acquire a partial reserve of strategic minerals of domestic production.

On amendment no. 33: Appropriates \$2,179,400 for the Medical Department, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,100,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$79,400 being incident to reopening the naval training station, Great Lakes.

On amendments nos. 34 to 37, both inclusive, relating to the appropriation "Aviation, Navy": Allocates \$11,020,450 to the maintenance and operation subhead, instead of \$10,755,150, as proposed by the House, and \$11,285,750, as proposed by the Senate; reduces the allocation of \$26,770,000 proposed by the House to the aircraft procurement subdivision by \$54,340, as proposed by the Senate, the amount of such reduction being added elsewhere for pay of employees, Bureau of Aeronautics; and fixes the amount of contract authorization at \$6,590,000, instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$8,180,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase agreed upon over the amount proposed by the House being for the procurement of spare parts for new airplanes.

On amendments nos. 38, 39, and 40, relating to the Marine Corps Reserve: Appropriates \$224,238, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$120,860, as proposed by the House, the entire increase being for clothing, and makes provision for clothing for aviation cadets, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 41: Makes a reappropriation of \$6,000,000, instead of \$11,690,000, as proposed by the Senate, of unobligated balances of certain prior year appropriations, in augmentation of the direct appropriation of \$88,310,000 proposed by the House under the head of "Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery", thus making the total available on account of the 24 ships to be laid down in the fiscal year 1936, \$20,690,000, instead of \$29,380,000, as proposed in the Budget, and \$26,380,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 43: Excepts the 15,000-ton aircraft carrier, the construction of which is to be initiated during the fiscal year 1936, from the requirement respecting a division of new ship construction work between Government and private yards, in conformity with the provisions of the Treaty Navy Authorization Act, approved March 27, 1934, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 45 and 46: Appropriates \$337,000 for salaries, Bureau of Aeronautics, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$282,660, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 47: Appropriates \$20,000 for printing historical naval documents, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House.

Disagreements

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On no 18: Relating to Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers on permanent active duty.

On no 28: Relating to the employment of enlisted men ashore in the capacity of household servants.

On no 42: Relating to the use of the appropriation "Increase of the Navy" for personal services and contingent and miscellaneous expenses in connection with the construction of vessels.

On no 44: Relating to data to accompany bids for constructing naval vessels.

On no 48: Relating to travel expenses of personnel of the services embraced by the Joint Service Pay Act of 1922 under orders home in connection with retirement.

GLOVER H. CARY,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, while there were a number of amendments placed on the bill in the Senate, a goodly number of them had no relation to the amount of money carried in the bill.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. What is the difference in the appropriations as the bill left the House and as it came from the Senate and as agreed to in your conference report?

Mr. CARY. If the gentleman will allow me a moment, I will make an explanation that will give that information.

Mr. McFARLANE. That is what I want.

Mr. CARY. The bill as passed by the House carried direct appropriations totaling \$457,805,261, and reappropriations to the total amount of \$7,500,000, providing for a total maximum expenditure of \$465,305,261. The House bill also carried a contract authorization of \$5,000,000.

As passed by the Senate, the direct appropriations totaled \$459,606,846, or \$1,801,585 more than the House bill; reappropriations were increased by \$5,690,000, or to \$13,190,000; and the contract authorization was raised from \$5,000,000 to \$8,180,000, or by \$3,180,000.

As agreed to by your conferees, the bill carries in direct appropriations \$879,118 in excess of the total amount approved by the House, the Senate conferees having receded from \$922,467 of the total amount added by the Senate, and from the reduction made in the amount proposed by the House for the Naval Research Laboratory.

The agreed increase is distributed as follows:

Reopening Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, various objects.....	\$142,940
---	-----------

The House provided a flat sum for the reopening of the naval training station and the Department indicated to the Senate a number of additional things that would need to be provided for and these required an additional appropriation of \$142,940.

Contingent expenses, Newport Training Station.....	\$12,500
New ferry for use at Newport, R. I.....	350,000

We were clearly convinced of the need for a new ferry. It was just a question of whether it should be started now or a year later. There seemed to be no reason for deferment because it is something that is absolutely necessary.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is not that a little high for that ferry?

Mr. CARY. I should not say so.

Clothing for Marine Corps Reserve.....	\$103,378
Maintenance and operation, naval aircraft and air stations.....	265,300
Printing historical naval records.....	5,000

Making a total of.....	879,118
------------------------	---------

As to reappropriations, we bring back a total \$7,500,000, but differently allocated than in the House bill. The House bill, it will be recalled, carried \$7,500,000 of reappropriations for the purpose of purchasing and creating a reserve supply of domestically produced and processed strategic minerals.

Mr. McFARLANE. What kind of minerals?

Mr. CARY. For strategic war minerals. The Senate struck out this proposal and diverted the money toward making available a larger amount to the extent of \$11,690,000 for new ship construction than the House had proposed, making up the difference between the \$7,500,000 and the \$11,690,000 by additional reappropriations. The Senate also added by way of reappropriations \$1,500,000 for the purchase of machine tools, making the Senate total of reappropriations \$13,190,000.

The House conferees have acceded to these Senate changes except as to the item on account of new ship construction. Instead of an addition of \$11,690,000 on account of new ship construction we bring back \$6,000,000.

In other words, we had a compromise on this item. The Senate wanted to add \$11,690,000 and we compromised and fixed it at \$6,000,000.

Mr. McFARLANE. Were there any other compromises that were made in favor of the House figures?

Mr. CARY. If the gentleman will read the conference report or listen to this statement he will find there were a number of such compromises. I direct the gentleman's attention to the report which has just been read by the Clerk.

Mr. McFARLANE. I have just been reading the report and I have noticed that most of these compromises are in favor of the Senate.

Mr. CARY. The gentleman is very much mistaken about that. The report will not support such an assertion.

Mr. McFARLANE. There were a number of corrections upward, I noticed.

Mr. CARY. It will be recalled that the Budget carries \$29,380,000 for beginning the construction of 24 naval vessels. The House provided one-half of such sum, or \$14,690,000. The Senate proposed to increase such amount to \$26,380,000 by making available \$11,690,000 of unobligated balances of certain prior year appropriations. The Conference Committee agreed to a total of \$20,690,000, of which \$6,000,000 will be made up of unobligated balances of prior year appropriations.

In connection with this matter I wish to say that the Senate conferees were unalterably opposed to an appropriation on account of these 24 new ships that would be insufficient to enable the Department to proceed with their construction as rapidly as contemplated by the Budget estimate.

This was the position the House took when the bill was passed here. We had received information at that time that the figures we had placed in the bill would be sufficient to carry on the program without interrupting the continuity of the program. Since that time the Navy Department had come to the conclusion it would take some more money and the Senate conferees were convinced they were right about it and we agreed with them about it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. As a matter of fact, every compromise that has been reached constitutes an increase in the figures fixed by the House?

Mr. CARY. No; that is not a fact. However, as to the funds for ship construction, I will say to the gentleman from New York that we have already embarked upon the program of building the Navy to treaty strength. The vessels to be commenced in 1936 will cost in the neighborhood of \$200,000,000. The appropriation we make here is merely an initial appropriation and it matters very little whether it is one figure or another, because the program will go through and the entire amount will have to be appropriated. This is just a question of what amount we appropriate as the initial appropriation to carry forward the program until the Congress convenes again.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have another brief question which I think we ought to have for the purpose of the Record. Can the gentleman state what the total amount will be for naval purposes if this conference report is adopted?

Mr. CARY. I have just given that figure.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want the total.

Mr. CARY. \$458,684,379.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And, as a matter of fact, it is several million dollars under the Budget estimate.

Mr. CARY. It is more than \$26,000,000 under the Budget estimate.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. GAMBRILL. I notice that you have increased the appropriation for the professors at the Naval Academy by \$33,000 to take care of 12.

Mr. CARY. Will the gentleman wait a moment until I reach that in my statement?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Yes.

Mr. CARY. The amount agreed upon for new ship construction, our information is, will enable work to proceed as rapidly as originally contemplated. Of course, if that be true, the original estimate was over large.

In any event, I wish to say for the benefit of those who feel that this program should wait upon the outcome of the naval conference to be held during this calendar year, that there is no requirement that any of the vessels which such

program embraces be laid down at any particular time and the President will be free to defer their commencement if he should conclude that to be the wiser course.

It works out that the amount of reappropriations, as agreed to, corresponds to the amount of reappropriations proposed by the House, so that the increase in direct appropriations of \$879,118, which I have already discussed, constitutes the sum total of additional Treasury demands beyond those created by the bill as passed by the House.

Turning to contract authorization, the House bill carried \$5,000,000 for the procurement of airplanes. The House cut down the amount in the estimates for spare parts for aircraft from 25 percent to 10 percent, yielding a reduction of \$3,180,000. The Senate proposed to restore the whole of this reduction by way of contract authorization. We have compromised, restoring one-half of the House reduction by way of contract authorization.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What percent of spare parts are here provided for?

Mr. CARY. About 17½ percent.

To summarize, the bill carries a total of \$458,684,379 in direct appropriations. Including reappropriations, the amount is \$466,184,379. In direct appropriations the amount is \$26,759,468 less than proposed in the Budget. Adding reappropriations, we come under the Budget to the extent of \$19,259,468.

The statement accompanying the conference report, which has been read, covers both amendments which do and do not affect the amounts of money carried by the bill. I see no occasion further to enlarge upon that statement. Before concluding, however, I wish to clear up some doubt that seems to prevail as to the intention respecting the addition made by the House to the estimate for pay of professors and instructors at the Naval Academy. The original estimates included \$232,400 for such purpose—\$207,300 for educators and \$25,100 for physical instructors. The House—and the Senate conferees have agreed—provided a total of \$265,400, of which \$242,600 is earmarked for educators and not exceeding \$22,800 for physical instructors. For the latter \$700 is included for automatic salary increases. There is available, therefore, \$35,300 definitely for the employment of additional educators. While the number is not specified, it was the thought of the committee that the increase would permit of the employment of 12, which is the number of former professors at the academy, let out in 1933, eligible or available for reemployment, who have not been reemployed. Whether those 12 former professors will be reemployed rests with the Department and the academy authorities. The increase the bill carries is not sufficient to pay those 12 the salaries they were receiving at the time of separation. Their salaries, if and when reemployed, would need to be accommodated to the amount available.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. GAMBRILL. The statement appears in the hearings that you had before your committee a representative of the 12 professors separated from the service in 1933. According to the interrogation of the witnesses by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], who is a skilled educator, it appears that in his mind, and probably in the mind of the gentleman from Kentucky, the idea that the 12 professors separated from the service should be reinstated. I hope the gentleman will be good enough to enlighten the House as to whether or not that is correct.

Mr. CARY. I will say this. Of course, this matter was brought to our attention, and the committee was sympathetic to those professors whose services it became necessary to terminate. While we realize that the committee has nothing to say about who shall or who shall not be employed, because that is an administrative matter that belongs to the officials of the Navy Department and the Academy, it was our hope that many of the men who were qualified and ought to be retained would be retained. However,

we realize that we could not provide that the men separated from the service should be reemployed and if reemployed that they should be paid the salary they got when they were separated from the service.

There is nothing in the bill that would require the reinstatement of the same ones who were separated from the service. We were sympathetic toward them and hoped that they would be reemployed.

Mr. GAMBRILL. I am obliged to the gentleman for this statement, and I want to give it some background.

There were 20 professors at the academy teaching cultural subjects who were separated from the service at a saving of sixty-odd thousand dollars. A few days after their separation, with the idea that they were embarking on an economy program, the Navy Department secured from the Public Works Administration \$238,000,000 for building ships of war and \$13,000,000 for aircraft.

A year ago I attempted to rectify the wrong done to these professors.

In the bill for the fiscal year 1935 there was an additional appropriation of sixty-odd thousand dollars to take care of reinstatement of 20 professors, but unfortunately a colloquy took place on the floor of the House and the then chairman of the subcommittee used language that could be interpreted that only 8 professors should be reinstated, although the appropriation was sufficient to take care of the reinstatement of the full 20. It was the idea of the committee when it passed the supply bill for 1935 to reinstate eight. It seems to me that this additional amount should be used for the purpose of reinstating the remainder of those professors who were separated from the service in 1933.

One other thought. The gentleman says the appropriation is not sufficient. That is correct. It would require about \$41,000, and the gentleman has appropriated \$33,000 additional. The gentleman took into consideration, I have no doubt, that probably not all of the 12 would be available, and also took into consideration that probably some of the 12 had secured positions elsewhere, but I certainly hope before the gentleman asks for the passage of this conference report that he will be more liberal and be willing to make a statement that it is the sincere hope of the committee that 12 instructors should be reinstated, or so many as may be available.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I tried to make myself clear on that as to what the committee's idea about it is. We had a number of these men before us, and as I said, we are sympathetic toward them, and I agree with the statement the gentleman from Maryland makes, but he realizes, and I know agrees with me, that this is a matter purely within the discretion of the authorities of the Naval Academy and the Navy Department. However, we hope that such of these men who have not been employed and who have not found work elsewhere and who are available and who are suitable for the positions open might be reemployed. We have nothing to do with that. That is purely administrative.

Mr. PARKS. These are all civilian employees of whom the gentleman speaks?

Mr. CARY. Yes.

Mr. PARKS. Have they been so dissociated from the service that they are gone?

Mr. CARY. Some of them have, but a number of them are within the proximity of the institution and are available.

I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 18: Page 14, line 23, after the word "duty", insert "and other officers above such grades employed on such class of active duty shall not be entitled to be paid a greater rate of pay and allowances than authorized by law for a lieutenant of the Navy or a captain of the Marine Corps entitled to not exceeding 10 years' longevity pay."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and other officers above such grades employed on such class of active duty (not to exceed 4 months in any calendar year) shall not be entitled to be paid a greater rate of pay and allowances than authorized by law for a lieutenant of the Navy or a captain of the Marine Corps entitled to not exceeding 10 years' longevity pay."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 28: Page 28, line 23, after the word "expeditions", insert "and in addition not to exceed 40 in number at such places as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur. The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 42: Page 51, line 8, after the word "vessels", strike out "heretofore authorized and herein or heretofore appropriated for in part" and insert "which have been or may hereafter be authorized."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 44: Page 54, after line 13, insert: "No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available to pay a contractor upon any contract for a naval vessel entered into under authority of this act unless, at the time of filing his bid, he shall also file the estimates upon which such bid was based."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 48: Page 62, beginning in line 1, insert: "Sec. 3. During the fiscal year 1935 and thereafter the words 'permanent change of station' as used in section 12 of the act approved May 18, 1920 (41 Stat. 604), as amended, shall be held to include the home of an officer or man to which he is ordered in connection with retirement."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

SHIP MORTGAGE ACT

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7205) to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, otherwise known as "section 30" of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, approved June 5, 1920, to allow the benefits of said act to be enjoyed by owners of certain vessels of the United States of less than 200 gross tons, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7205, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 21, after "United States", insert "and for the purposes of this act the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall, in addition to those designated in sections 37 and 38 of this act, be deemed a citizen of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider the vote by which it was concurred in laid on the table.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1958) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CONNERY, RAMSPECK, GRISWOLD, WELCH, and LAMBERTSON.

THE LATE JOSEPH P. HINES

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a belated tribute to a faithful public servant who died 1 year ago today, after the adjournment of Congress. Joseph P. Hines, of Louisville, Ky., came to Washington in 1912 as secretary to one of my predecessors, Hon. Swagar Sherley, formerly Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. From that time until last year he served in many capacities for the Government in Washington. He was a man who was respected, honored, and beloved by all who knew him. He is dead, but he lives, Mr. Speaker, in the hearts of all who knew him.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the major domo of the Democratic Party announced yesterday there would be no more general debate. He was afraid that someone would "blow off" or "spread false propaganda" against the administration. I am afraid of that myself, and I shall have to object.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not know who the major domo is.

Mr. SNELL. The major domo was "General" O'CONNOR.

Mr. BOYLAN. I have no connection with the major domo.

Mr. SNELL. If there is going to be no more general debate on this side, there is going to be no more on that side by unanimous consent, even by my good friend Mr. BOYLAN.

Mr. BOYLAN. This is not general debate. This is simply a little address I wanted to make, and it is nonpolitical.

Mr. SNELL. I shall have to object.

CHARLES HENRY NIEHAUS

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, Charles Henry Niehaus, one of America's great men, my dear friend and neighbor, departed this life in Cliffside Park, N. J., Wednesday, June 19, 1935.

When the history of American sculptors shall have been written, his name will be recorded in the forefront.

His art and sculpture will forever adorn this Capitol, the District of Columbia, and many States of the Union.

Surviving him is his loyal daughter, Marie Niehaus, beloved by all who know her for her devotion to, and tender care of, her illustrious father. In paying deserved tribute to my sculptor friend, I feel free to draw liberally from her biography of the great sculptor.

Born in Cincinnati, Ohio, January 24, 1855, he early devoted himself to wood engraving, stonecutting, and carving in marble. While yet a boy he was a capable draftsman, and as a very young man he modeled in clay. His fondness for his work prompted him to become a pupil at the McMicken School of Design, in Cincinnati, where he won first prize in drawing and modeling. Of meager means, but enthusiastic and determined, he traveled to Munich, Germany, where he entered the Royal Academy and there he

won his way to honors and a commission. At the time of his matriculation, he gained the distinction of obtaining first-prize medal for composition entitled "Fleeting Time." Before he returned to America, he journeyed through the countries of Europe, viewing the sculpture of the Old World, the masterpieces of the Renaissance period, and the ruins of Athens and Rome. In Manchester, England, before leaving for home, he engaged in executing busts of persons of note, including Lord Disraeli.

Arriving back in America in 1881, he wended his way to his native State of Ohio, and while still a youth received two commissions providing for memorials to the memory of President Garfield. The State of Ohio raised funds for a statue of Garfield to be placed in the rotunda at the Capitol at Washington.

Public subscriptions furnished funds for another statue of Garfield to be erected on Race Street in Cincinnati. The young sculptor who had won his spurs abroad was honored by the people of Ohio with these commissions. His sculpture was such a success that a further commission followed to model the statue of William Allen, a gift of the State of Ohio to Statuary Hall in the Capitol. He had by this time developed his artistic talent, gaining much fame. However, he wished further opportunity for study and experimentation and for that purpose went to Italy. He established a studio in Rome in the Villa Strohl-Fern adjoining the Borghese Palace just outside of Porta del Popolo, devoting his time to production of art for art's sake.

Three of his models have been preserved and are in this country. They are the Scaper, or Greek Athlete Using a Strigil, Caestus, and Silenus. The former received Italian recognition which made him a Fellow of L'Associazione della Artistica Internazionale di Roma. At the World's Columbian Exposition it was recommended for a special medal.

In 1885 he established his studio in New York City and later removed to Cliffside Park, N. J., in the Palisades, overlooking the majestic Hudson River. At these studios he executed his finest sculpture.

As an artist, he obtained membership in the Council of the National Sculpture Society, the Architectural League of America, Municipal Art Society, of the Society for the Preservation of Historic and Scenic Places of the National Arts Club, of the Players Club, and of the Ohio Society.

Mr. Niehaus received the commission to make the statues of Hooker and Davenport and illustrative tympanums for the statehouse of Connecticut. Davenport, suggesting the founding of Yale University and the earliest historic interest of New Haven, and Hooker standing in similar character for Hartford, are the two figures of Connecticut which arose out of the perspective of Pilgrim days. These statues, with the accompanying tympanums, were commissioned to my friend through a committee of which Charles D. Warner was the guiding spirit. Of the completed work, Mr. Warner wrote of them as "spirited and beautiful."

When the Municipal Art Society of the city of New York offered prizes for designs for drinking fountains for city streets, Mr. Niehaus furnished 5 designs, 5 of which were prize winners.

The Astor memorial doors of Trinity Church of New York were the gift of Mr. Astor. Competition determined the choice of the sculptors who were restricted to one subject, and the manner of its treatment was the test of selection not only for the sculptors but for the character of subject which should be assigned him. The subject decided for the competition was the expulsion of the Garden of Eden and from the design submitted, Mr. Niehaus won the award to execute the south or historical doors. In *Harpers Weekly*, June 10, 1893, Charles de Kay, art critic, wrote descriptively of them and of the history of their gift as follows:

Bronze doors in one piece and decorated with panels carved in relief are Mr. William Waldorf Astor's gift to Trinity Church in memory of his father, the late John Jacob Astor. * * * The massive look of the doors and the color of the bronze, somber yet rich, suit very well the stately architecture of Trinity and the somber but warm tones of the stone.

John Jacob Astor, second of the name, took great pride in Trinity and enriched the chancel with a costly reredos. He was the most faithful of vestrymen, and until his last years rarely

failed to carry about the plate for the offertory; so that to the worshippers in Trinity these doors will recall his tall and dignified figure, his kindly, urbane face. They will recall his unaffected modesty and readiness to interest himself in all public and social affairs, from the call to arms at the outbreak of the Civil War to the functions that are mere weariness to the flesh to a conscientious man past middle age. But to the general public they are very notable embellishments of the city, owing to the conspicuous place Trinity occupies on Wall Street and Broadway. It was a happy thought to make sculptured doors the memorial for a site so central and so close to the swiftest tide of traffic—a thought which, in all likelihood, came to the son because of his early studies in sculpture.

The south door, by Mr. Niehaus, has six panels dealing with historical subjects connected with New York and Trinity Parish. The lowest panels show the deck of the *Half Moon*; Henry Hudson is passing, in 1609, along Manhattan Island under the Dutch flag; Dr. Barclay is preaching to the Indians. To fit the mission among the redskins more closely to this church, Mr. Niehaus has passed by the earlier efforts of Dutch dominion in the same field. The middle panels show Washington entering St. Paul's, the chapel of Trinity, after his inauguration in 1789; and the scene of a consecration of four bishops in the same chapel in 1832. The upper panels contain the procession in 1846 through the porch of new Trinity as we now have it, soon after its completion; and the reredos in memory of William B. Astor in 1877.

In these six panels the sculptor has undertaken a difficult task of realism, and with success. The composition is generally excellent; the perspective is particularly brilliant. Mr. Niehaus has kept marvelously well the difficult planes of figures, buildings, and interiors, each in its proper place, and has borrowed from painting many artifices which permit the eye to pass agreeably from the near to the more distant objects. The figures never press forward but keep their relations to the general aspect of the door as a door, and also to their several backgrounds. The figures, moreover, are well proportioned and unconventional.

The most modern scene is, in some respects, the best, although it might easily have been the worst, owing to the difficulty of managing modern coats, hats, and dresses, and presenting in low relief an interior known to everyone. He has done this without being commonplace or trivial. Henry Hudson is the least convincing of all, because we look for more rough and sailorly qualities in the captain and crew of the *Half Moon* than the sculptor has been willing to allow.

Some 50 artists and sculptors executed the pictorial and plastic aspects for the Congressional Library at the National Capital. There are 16 statuary figures representing foremost characters almost from the beginning of history. Mr. Niehaus received the commission for Moses as typifying the Law and Gibbon as representing History.

Mr. Niehaus also executed for the Congressional Library three door spandrels which were carved in wood from his designs.

When a place in the rotunda of the Capital was reserved for two renowned sons of each of the States, Ohio sent the figures of Garfield and William Allen, executed by Niehaus. The latter was famous as a speaker, and the quality of his voice won him the sobriquet of "Foghorn Bill Allen." Mr. Niehaus represented him as an orator in a positive attitude. President Garfield was represented by him as the statesman-orator; his rostrum was beside him, and out of sentiment for his untimely death a wreath with crossed palms was laid at his feet.

In 1900 the State of Indiana provided for a statue to the memory of its war Governor, Oliver P. Morton. A product of Mr. Niehaus, it was sent by the State for a place in the rotunda of the Capital.

In the Senate Chamber, too, can be found a bust of Vice President Tompkins, by Niehaus.

The Hahnemann Monument at Scott Circle in Washington bears further testimony to the art and skill of Charles H. Niehaus. The Homeopaths of America provided the funds for this work. In their published report is found the following:

It was decided to ask sculptors to submit sketches for competition, and to award prizes for the best three. * * * Twenty-four models were submitted by sculptors from St. Louis, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, New Haven, Brooklyn, and New York, as well as Paris, Rome, and Florence, representing American, French, German, Spanish, and Italian sculpture. They were exhibited to the public at the gallery of the American Academy of Fine Arts during the week beginning February 4, 1895, being the first exhibition of the kind in this country. The press was invited to a private view, whereby attention was called to the undertaking and a notoriety given it that no other similar sculptural work has obtained. The committee, together with the advisory committee of the National Sculpture Society, consisting of Messrs. Daniel C. French, George E. Bissell, Olin L. Warner, representing

the sculptors, Thomas Hastings and Russell Sturgis representing the architects, unanimously awarded the first prize to the American sculptor, Charles H. Niehaus, and his design was accepted as the model for the proposed monument.

The unveiling of the monument took place on June 21, 1900. President McKinley was present to make an address. The Washington Star, describing the monument, said in part:

The monument which will thus be added to the art treasures of the Nation's Capital is, in the opinion of the National Sculpture Society, under whose auspices the competition for the design of the monument was carried on, as well as others who are qualified to form an opinion, a beautiful as well as an appropriate creation of art. The sitting statue of Hahnemann occupies the central point on the stone platform, which is approached from the front by four steps, and at the back of which rises the superstructure, which is elliptical in form. The treatment is Greek in spirit, and the details are in harmony with this conception. The central portion of the superstructure forming the background of the statue is composed of four columns supporting an entablature. Above this rises what is known as an "attica", bearing the principal inscription: "Hahnemann." Between the two front columns is a niche, which is also elliptical in form, and which terminates in a semicircular arch. Along the base of the elliptical wall are stone seats. Upon the pedestal supporting the statue is the inscription "Similia similibus curantur." On either side of the arch are decorative emblems in bas-relief, a bowl and serpent, the symbols of wisdom, and a lamp and book, typical of knowledge. In two panels in either side of the niche are placed commemorative tablets, representing in bas-relief of bronze the four epoch-making periods of Hahnemann's life, namely, the nightly vigils of the student, the investigation of the chemist, the teacher addressing his class in the university, and the success of his treatment of typhus patients at the hospital. The statue itself is of bronze, the features copied from the bust made by the famous artist, David.

The sculptor, Mr. C. H. Niehaus, whose design has been so successfully wrought out, took into consideration the fact in completing the details that the monument was to be in an open space, so that it could be observed from all sides. He therefore sought to make it attractive from every point of view, and gave much attention to the designing of the rear. The main lines of the central portion of the elliptical wall are repeated in the rear, excepting that the niches are omitted, and in the upper portion there is a decorative tympanum. Across the center, in roman numerals, appear the date of erection and the dates of Hahnemann's birth and death, the latter being encircled with laurel wreaths. In the tympanum of the arch are two figures in bas-relief emblematic of the science of medicine. Underneath this is a fountain in the form of a fluted basin, with a stream of water issuing from a carved dolphin.

The plaster model of the figure of Hahnemann won a gold medal at the Pan American Exposition.

During the campaign of President McKinley for reelection the Ohio Society of New York honored my late sculptor friend by a banquet, for which extensive preparations were made. Among them was the plan to have predominating a huge bust of the President. Mr. Niehaus undertook this work, but abandoned the idea of an exaggerated size when time did not serve to carry out the original intention. Accordingly he executed a life-size half figure of President McKinley in his characteristic attitude of speaking. Following the tragedy at Buffalo the bust was placed on exhibition at Tiffany's, and within a short time the Honorable Charles H. Hackley, a former patron of the sculptor, commissioned Mr. Niehaus to execute a statue. The design shows McKinley as he made his famous speech at the Pan American Exposition the day preceding his assassination. Circling the base of the statue are the words "Our future conquests must lie in the victories of peace."

When the Appellate Division Courthouse, located at Madison Avenue and Twenty-fifth Street, New York, was being erected, its architect, James Brown Lord, selected Mr. Niehaus as advisory sculptor and gave him the largest piece to execute, that of the 50-foot pediment over the entrance. Mr. Niehaus' group for the pediment defines the Triumph of the Law, the subject being centered in a seated female figure supporting two tablets bearing the inscription, respectively, of *Lex Scripta* and *Lex Tradita*. Upon her right and left Courage and Valor draw their swords in her defense, and Strength, Wisdom, and Antiquity, with details of symbols, attend her.

At the behest of the Honorable Charles Hackley, the donor, Mr. Niehaus executed the statues of Farragut and Lincoln for Hackley Square, Muskegon, Mich. They were unveiled Memorial Day, 1900. Another statue of Lincoln, similar but

distinctive, was made by Mr. Niehaus for the Buffalo Historical Society.

Among his other works, Mr. Niehaus, shortly after establishing his studio at New York, executed the relief known as "Surrender of the Hessians" on the monument to Washington, at Trenton, in my State of New Jersey.

In the Monument News of November 1901 there appears a reproduction of the Drake Monument at Titusville, Pa., together with the following description:

The nucleus of the design is a classic fane of simple Grecian type, approached by a semicircular sweep of low steps and adorned with four ionic columns. It encloses a vaulted and arched niche in which is mounted in a half-seated, half-crouching attitude on a circular pedestal a bronze heroic figure, The Driller, symbolizing the energy of labor and modeled by Charles H. Niehaus. Extending from each side of the fane are curved wings forming the backs of seats and terminating in pillars bearing symbolic figures carved in high relief. The wings are 12 feet high and extend to a width of 28 feet, while the highest point of the roof over the central figure is 18 feet from the base.

The Driller is a forceful example of Mr. Niehaus' work, and shows a magnificently muscled figure with uplifted hammer in the act of driving the drill into the rock. It is instinct with life and vigor, and is strikingly adapted to typifying a pioneer of industry. The figures at the ends of the wings are symbolic representations of Memory and Grief. Memory, to the left of the monument, is a heavily draped figure, in the act of weaving a chaplet, to commemorate the dead. Grief, to the right, is shown carrying an urn, around which is carved the ivy of devotion. The wings are divided into six panels, perforated at the top in latticed design, and each one bearing an inscription telling part of the story of Mr. Drake's life and achievements. No representation of him is to be found on the monument, the idea being to typify his works by suggestive artistic figures rather than to attempt portraiture.

The work was constructed for Mr. C. N. Payne, of the National Transit Co., who represented an unknown donor, supposed to be one of the officials of the Standard Oil Co.

At the Pan American Exposition there was represented more garden sculpture than ever before at any exposition. The series of fountains, groups, and architectural decorations constitute special features of the exposition. Mr. Niehaus contributed two of the largest groups of the Fountain of Nature.

In June 1901 the Chicago Inter Ocean referred to Mr. Niehaus' groups with the following:

Charles H. Niehaus contributes two of the groups of the commissioned sculpture. These, in representing the subject Mineral Wealth, he has centralized into the Story of Gold and the Story of Light, as interpreting, respectively, solid and fluid mineralogy. In the Story of Gold the Genius of Opportunity is seen calling through her fingers to waken the world to its waiting possibilities, and in the Story of Light the Genius of Inspiration is holding aloft a torch to show the source of enlightenment. About these pivotal female figures the sculptor has further elaborated his theme by male figures engaged in the manual unfolding of the Story of Gold and the Story of Light, each one's occupation allowing the artist a wide range of muscular posing and vigorous treatment.

In the Story of Gold one man is carrying a wand of witch-hazel, which he stretches out searchingly for the magnetic response which indicates the gold's location; another is digging for the ore; while still another is washing it in a stream. One of the graceful and harmonious bits is the introduction of a primitive crucible with a man smelting the precious treasure, while a restful and human touch is given in two figures, one of which stops in his work to engage in conversation with his fellow laborer near by.

The Story of Light is more subtle in its conception, although hardly less vigorous or versatile in its handling. As in its companion group, the conceived idea is conveyed in an allegorical female figure towering over the actual group. The woman is the Genius of Inspiration and she holds aloft her torch of enlightenment.

In this, as in the other groups, Mr. Niehaus has used primitive utensils as graceful accessories to make his groups hang together effectively. One man is drilling for gas; another is beside a tripod; one is blowing glass. Each figure in both of the groups has been carefully studied; any one of them might well stand for the central idea of the entire group in which it is incorporated as a part.

The Dewey Arch, while an ephemeral undertaking, was the associated labor of the representative sculptors of America. Mr. Niehaus executed one of the four groups featured on the sides. It was called Triumphant Return. This was in commemoration of the victory of Admiral Dewey at Manila.

Mr. Niehaus also executed the design for the equestrian statue of Forrest, the great cavalry leader, for erection at Memphis, Tenn.

Other notable works of this prolific and eminent sculptor are: Bust of Hon. Charles H. Hackley, Muskegon, Mich.; bust of Robert Blum, Art Museum, Cincinnati, Ohio; colossal statue of St. Louis and group for St. Louis, Mo.; bust of Rev. Dr. Collier, Cooper Union, New York; statue of Hon. J. J. Ingalls, Statuary Hall, National Capitol; bust of H. H. Rogers; McKinley Statue and Lunette National Memorial, Canton, Ohio; Harrison Monument, Indianapolis, Ind.; Beardsley Monument, Bridgeport, Conn.; statue of Governor Goebel, Frankfort, Ky.; pediment for new State capitol, Frankfort, Ky.; John Paul Jones Monument, Washington, D. C.; Commodore Perry Monument, Buffalo, N. Y.; Zachariah Chandler statue, Statuary Hall, National Capitol; Governor Glick statue, Statuary Hall, National Capitol; Hernandez Cortez statue, World's Fair, San Francisco, Calif.; Francis Scott Key Monument, Baltimore, Md.; Soldiers' and Sailors' Memorial, Hoboken, N. J.; Soldiers' and Sailors' Memorial, Newark, N. J.; Soldiers' and Sailors' Memorial, Hackensack, N. J.; Soldiers' and Sailors' Memorial, Des Moines, Iowa; Henry Clay, Statuary Hall, Washington, D. C.; E. McDowell, Statuary Hall, Washington, D. C.

His last work was a bust of Abraham Lincoln now in his late home in Cliffside Park, N. J. I have viewed this work with admiration and reverence. Character, as exemplified by Lincoln, radiates from this wonderful achievement of the sculptor. Of the finest grade of Cararra marble, especially transparent, cut by chisel throughout, it is veritably a treasure—a treasure of art.

Any one of his productions would have gained him fame; his combined works, which have added immeasurably to the national wealth, at the Capitol and over the Nation, place him among our immortals.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN ADEQUATE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE AND PACIFIC COAST SHIPBUILDING

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by revising and bringing up to date the remarks I made on April 29 last with reference to our merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, during the present session of Congress I have invited the attention of the House of Representatives to some of the problems of the American merchant marine. The President of the United States has forcefully brought this matter to the attention of the Nation by sending a special message to Congress dealing with the subject. More recently the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am glad to be a member, has held hearings on this problem and has reported favorably a bill, H. R. 8555, which I confidently believe will meet the needs of the present situation.

We are all in common accord that an adequate merchant marine is necessary. It is necessary in time of peace in order that the entry of American goods into world channels of trade might be guaranteed equality in transportation costs with that of other nations. It is necessary in time of war in which the United States may not be engaged in order to carry on trade and commerce when the ships of other nations might be withdrawn to assist their own navies. It is necessary that we might have an adequate naval auxiliary to meet our own war-time requirements for the transportation of troops, supplies, and equipment. It is necessary that we have adequate shipbuilding facilities always available on our Atlantic and Pacific coasts prepared to meet any emergency requirement.

The President has emphasized these reasons and has stated that direct ship subsidies should be made—

Based upon providing for American shipping, Government aid to make up the differential between American and foreign shipping costs. It should cover, first, the difference in the cost of building ships; second, the difference in the cost of operating ships; and, finally, it should take into consideration the liberal subsidies that many foreign governments provide for their shipping.

Our own experience and the heavy outlays that have been necessary whenever emergencies have arisen point to the urgency of this matter. The United States could have maintained an adequate merchant marine from the foundation of

the country up to the World War at one-half the expense that was necessary at the beginning of that war had we maintained a far-sighted policy. Instead, we permitted American manufacturers and producers to depend on foreign bottoms for shipping American goods. When these ships were withdrawn from trade routes our commerce was helpless. We cannot permit that condition to ever exist again.

Every major maritime nation upon the face of the earth subsidizes its merchant marine directly and openly. The United States stands alone among the nations of the world as one with major maritime interests granting subsidies by subterfuge, under the guise of mail contracts. The time has come when we must recognize the national necessity and purpose of an adequate merchant marine by granting these subsidies openly and directly. They should be granted for ship construction to meet the unfair competition imposed by lower standards of living and consequent cheaper costs in foreign countries. They should be granted for ship operation to such routes in international, intercoastal, and coastal trade that will stimulate commerce, insure flexibility in operation, parity in competition, and surety in protection. The savings to American agriculture and industry thus effected will be far greater than the direct cost to the United States Government and will ultimately save the American taxpayer large sums.

The impetus given to a study of our merchant marine problems by our experience during the World War brought about an orderly plan in its development, but the time has now come when we must rehabilitate and maintain our merchant marine at its highest efficiency in accordance with that plan.

While the United States ranks second only to Great Britain in gross tonnage available for ocean-going traffic, a large part of it is what may be termed "static tonnage." Many of these vessels built during and immediately following the World War cannot meet the competition of modern ships. Technical advances made in type, machinery, and equipment of ocean-going vessels has actually caused the United States merchant fleet to drop to fourth or fifth place among the nations. It is surpassed by every major maritime nation when measured in its ability to quickly and economically carry cargoes from port to port.

Of our entire merchant marine, the United States has only built 11 percent since January 1, 1924, while Great Britain has built 42 percent; Germany, 38 percent; France, 25 percent; Italy, 28 percent; and, Japan, 21 percent. With 89 percent of our merchant marine composed of ships over 11 years old, economy in their operation and fair competition with the ships of other nations is almost futile.

Fuel consumption alone is 30 to 40 percent less on modern vessels than on those built 12 years ago. Mechanical equipment has been improved during the past decade to reduce costs, and other operation costs are similarly higher on older ships. In these times when speed of delivery is a major economic factor, the delays caused by the slower movement of these older vessels adds appreciably to the handicap American shipping has to overcome, as well as to operation costs. Steps must be taken now to regain the cargoes we are losing in ever-increasing numbers.

Coincident with the need for an adequate merchant marine is the need for adequate shipbuilding facilities on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. No greater insurance can be given for the success of our Navy than to have proper private shipbuilding and ship-repair yards always available to meet our needs in emergency. The problems involved are much easier of solution on the Atlantic seaboard than on the Pacific coast. At the same time, the need is probably far greater on the Pacific coast than on the Atlantic.

I can recall when shipbuilding was one of the major industries of the Pacific coast. Today it is almost a lost art. Thousands of artisans who formerly worked in shipyards have had to turn their efforts to other lines of trade. Not a single large merchant vessel has been built on the Pacific coast since the World War. With the advent of metal ships, sources of raw material are so distant that shipbuilders, looking primarily to profits, practically ceased west-coast

construction because they could not meet east-coast prices and pay the costs of transportation of supplies to the Pacific.

Under present merchant marine legislation we have loaned \$150,000,000 at nominal rates of interest for ship construction. Every dollar of that money has entered into ships constructed within a few hundred miles of this Capitol Building. Certainly, we do not mean national security includes only shipyards within a short radius of Washington. If the primary purpose of this ship-subsidy legislation is to build our merchant marine and shipyards for national security, it must include shipyards on the Pacific coast as well as the Atlantic.

The result of all this has been that there is today not a single privately owned major shipyard on the Pacific coast capable of building a capital ship without first spending large sums to repair their equipment. Notwithstanding this, the United States needs such plants to be available in event of emergency. It must encourage private ship construction on the Pacific coast to guarantee the availability of such shipyards in time of war.

As I have already pointed out, the President has stated as the first purpose in granting these subsidies is to make up the differential between American and foreign costs of ship construction. If this differential is necessary between American and foreign construction, and we are in agreement that it is, the same principle holds true in ship construction in different sections of the United States. There should be a differential allowed to equalize the differences in cost of shipbuilding on the Pacific and Atlantic seaboard.

At one time the Navy Department recognized this principle by allowing a differential in the cost of ship construction at the navy yards on the Pacific coast to equalize the increases due to transportation costs. Congress should also recognize this need and encourage private ship construction. To this end I recommended to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and they have included in this bill, H. R. 8555, provision for a direct 6-percent differential in favor of the construction of ships in Pacific coast shipyards for vessels to enter into the foreign trade and commerce of the Pacific coast and the equivalent of this 6-percent differential through a three-fourths of 1 percent reduction in the interest rate charged for construction loans on ships constructed on the Pacific coast for domestic trade, coastal or intercoastal, home ports of which will be on the Pacific coast. This principle is agreed as necessary by representatives of the shipping and shipbuilding industry, whose primary interests are on the Atlantic seaboard.

This policy will encourage the rebuilding of shipyards already on the Pacific coast but now used only for ship repairs, thus guaranteeing to the United States adequate ship construction and repair facilities for capital ships, both merchantmen and naval.

The effectiveness of our efforts will depend in some measure upon the administration of such legislation as may be enacted. Upon Congress rests the responsibility of effecting the policy and appropriating the funds. We should now prepare to regain our portion of the world's commerce. We should now stimulate American ship construction in all sections of our coast. If we do not, we cannot hope to overcome the obstacles which will be in our way as international trade increases with improving conditions. Neither can we hope to avoid wasteful expenditure of billions of dollars to provide an adequate naval auxiliary should an international crisis arise. It is the cheapest form of insurance, guaranteeing security to our commerce in time of peace and security to our Nation in time of war.

CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF DISTRICT POSTMASTERS

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered in Martinsburg, W. Va., yesterday on the foundation of the Rural Free Delivery System, made by Assistant Postmaster General J. Austin Latimer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. J. Austin Latimer, Special Assistant to the Postmaster General, at the State convention of the National League of District Postmasters, Martinsburg, W. Va., Friday, June 21, 1935:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, it has been my privilege to attend conventions of the League of District Postmasters in a number of States during the past few years, but this is the first occasion on which I have had the pleasure of meeting with you postmasters of West Virginia.

When your able Representative in Congress, and my good friend, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, extended your invitation to me, I accepted with a great deal of pleasure, as it afforded me not only an opportunity to visit your State for the first time, but to appear on this program with him and your National and State officers.

I come here not only to represent the Post Office Department—possibly the greatest business establishment in the world—but to bring you Postmaster General Farley's personal greetings and best wishes for a very successful convention.

As you know, the Post Office Department is fully alive to the advantages and benefits that accrue both to the Department and to each one of you postmasters through such an organization as this. It is the finest medium for the exchange of ideas beneficial to the Postal Service that we can have, and it is so recognized.

No persons in public life have greater opportunities for service than postmasters and other postal workers. You are not only, in many cases, the only direct representative of the Federal Government in your community, but in your daily contacts with the public you have an opportunity and responsibility which few men and women enjoy. The high purposes of government require that, regardless of the race, creed, or political affiliations of your patrons, you give them complete and equal service. As a district postmaster of Mississippi expressed it in a letter appearing in a recent issue of the Postmasters Advocate—

"A postmaster must be, or at least is expected to be, the best-informed person in the community. They must know human nature, the whims, the heartaches, the joys, the financial standing of their entire community, and in addition must know the addresses of all who have moved away, even though they slip off in the nighttime. They must know the cause for the delay in any mail due their patrons when it is called for. In other words, they must be a living, walking, sitting bureau of general information, never failing, never tiring. In order to do so and be all of the above, the postmaster must avail himself of every possible opportunity for informing himself."

The efficiency and courtesy with which you perform this public service, and the dignity with which you conduct yourselves as officers and men oftentimes is the measure of respect your fellow citizens have for the Government.

Just before leaving Washington, I had a little chat with Mr. Martin Scranage, assistant superintendent of the Division of Postmasters, who hails from Fairmont, W. Va., and who was a personal friend of Postmaster General William Lyne Wilson. "Mr. Wilson was indeed a fine man", he said—"one of the ablest men in West Virginia, a wonderful speaker with a wonderful personality, who took particular delight in helping young men in their careers", and I find the printed life of Mr. Wilson corroborates all the fine things Mr. Scranage had to say of him.

Inasmuch as William L. Wilson is the only Postmaster General from West Virginia, and it is quite possible there are some in the audience here today who knew him personally, perhaps it would not be amiss for me to review a few events in the life of this outstanding statesman, best known as the "Father of the Wilson tariff bill", who placed principles above political expediency and duty above self. The New York Times in an editorial concerning Mr. Wilson's work as Postmaster General, made the statement—

"There is not at this moment a single man in public life in the United States who has rendered more practical, difficult, and enduring service."

During his term as Postmaster General, the rural delivery system was put into operation—the first experimental rural delivery service in the United States being established from Charlestown, Uvilla, and Halltown, W. Va., effective October 1, 1896, with H. C. Gibson and Frank Young the first rural carriers. Rules governing promotion in the Department itself, and in the Railway Mail Service were adopted, the purpose of which was to stimulate and reward merit; and a strong and persistent effort was made to secure from Congress the passage of laws for the correction of abuses in second-class mail matter, and for the consolidation of post offices into districts, thereby bringing a large number of the fourth-class office under civil service; reforms whereby the Postal Service of the country would be improved and made self-supporting.

As an educator, statesman, and high Government official, few men have rendered more outstanding service than William Lyne Wilson.

Because my first connection with the Post Office Department was as secretary to Postmaster General Farley, I am particularly interested in coming to the home town of that distinguished Democrat and American, Newton D. Baker, who served in a similar capacity under Postmaster General Wilson. I know that I am voicing not only your sentiments, but those of the entire country, when I say that Mr. Baker is the most outstanding son of Martinsburg living today. It is interesting to note how closely his life was entwined with the lives of those two great Virginian Wilsons—Woodrow and

William Lyne, and we are safe in assuming that his close association with Woodrow Wilson while a student at Princeton, and his intimate contact with William Lyne Wilson played an important part in preparing Newton D. Baker for the heavy responsibilities later to be placed on his shoulders.

In the State of West Virginia today there are 425 rural routes covering 11,402 miles, and 268 miles of air mail routes, with three scheduled stops. Prior to the reorganization of the Air Mail Service your State was without any air mail facilities whatsoever, and it took 6 hours for mail to travel by train between two stops in your State where now the airplane carries it in just 1 hour.

In the matter of post offices, I find West Virginia has 1,733 offices—more than any of the other States excepting New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Kentucky.

As you postmasters, of course, know postal receipts reached low-water mark during July 1933, when they amounted to only forty-two and one-half million dollars. In April of this year the receipts were fifty-four and one-half million, an increase of slightly over 28 percent. Inasmuch as it is generally conceded that the fluctuations of the postal revenues are a good index to business conditions, these figures are certainly encouraging.

Mr. Slattery, our comptroller, recently stated to me, "I feel that the Postal Service is definitely out of the depression insofar as revenues are concerned and that recovery measured in terms of postal revenues is well under way."

What does this mean to you and to me? It means that the pay cut has been restored; that furloughs are a thing of the past; that vacancies are being filled as they occur, except at a few offices where it appears there is still a surplus. It means that since last August hundreds of substitutes have been advanced to regular positions, though the Department is not relaxing its efforts in their behalf.

All this could not be accomplished in a day nor in a year. It could not be accomplished without some hardships. It could not have been accomplished without the loyal and continued cooperation of our entire personnel during that trying, discouraging period of the pay cut and the furlough. But now recovery in the Postal Service is well under way, and in like manner recovery throughout this great country in general is under way as the President's great recovery program swings into action.

I say to you, without hesitation and without fear of successful contradiction, that we have today in the White House one of the greatest administrators this Nation has ever known. In the dark days of early 1932, when the skies were overcast and our country seemed on the brink of disaster, a prominent Democratic politician was asked the question, "What is the greatest need of the Democratic Party?" His answer was, "More Democrats." If I should be asked, "What is the great need of our country today," I would answer in all sincerity, "More men in high places like Franklin D. Roosevelt." Let us of the Postal Service be loyal not only to our own organization and our own Department but, regardless of our political faith, loyal to the administration and our beloved President, who is giving every ounce of his energy and effort to leading this country back to happier days. I know that you feel, as I do, a pride in having a part in the administration of President Roosevelt, and that it is a privilege to help him in his program of relief, recovery, and reform. You know and I know that our great leader is not thinking in terms of political parties, but, like two of his great predecessors, Lincoln and Wilson, the serious responsibility of his leadership makes him conscious of his duty to every American, and we rejoice that Franklin D. Roosevelt has faith in the American people and in the God that watches over them.

MEXICO

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an address delivered in New York at the invitation of Station WOR on their forum hour, May 5, 1935, by Mr. Eduardo Villaseñor, Mexican consul general, stationed in New York City. Since the Mexican Government dares to submit its case to the world and more specifically to the judgment of the American people, I feel obliged to refute the numerous falsehoods and misrepresentations which abounded in the discourse of Mr. Villaseñor.

In the first paragraph of his address the Mexican consul general pretends that there is going on a campaign carried out against Mexico "by the Catholic hierarchy." This is a cowardly lie. It is well known that the organ of the Episcopal Church—The Living Church—in this country has more than once condemned the Mexican attitude on religion as a "major scandal in world affairs." Numerous enlightened, intelligent, and fair-minded Protestant prelates and laymen, Jewish rabbis, and leaders of public opinion have in unmistakable terms, and on occasions too numerous to mention, condemned the assault on God which is now being carried on in the Republic of Mexico. Only a few weeks ago there

was published in the city of New York a carefully documented volume entitled "Chaos in Mexico", by Dr. Charles S. McFarland, secretary general emeritus of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Dr. McFarland made a careful and extensive visit to Mexico precisely to find out whether religion as such and not merely the Catholic Church was the subject of persecution. He returned a categorical answer on that subject, stating that the assault was one upon the idea of God and religion as such. The American Hebrew has likewise protested against the persecution of all religions in Mexico. Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians have likewise protested against this persecution. The National Conference of Jews and Christians has gone on record in most emphatic terms condemning the official Mexican persecution of religion. Jewish synagogues have been closed in Mexico. Mormon temples in the State of Chihuahua have been closed for the purpose of public worship. Even the schools conducted by British, French, and American citizens have been given the choice of accepting socialistic and gross forms of sexual education or complete elimination from the Mexican scene.

In the second paragraph of his speech, Mr. Villaseñor makes mention of "historical facts." I challenge him to deny the following historical facts: First. That the first hospital on this continent was the Hospital of Jesus in Mexico City; that the first university was founded under religious auspices in Mexico; that the first medical school was erected; and that the first printing press and first book available on the North American Continent were brought from Spain to Mexico by the first Bishop of Mexico City. The first book printed in North America came from the press of Bishop Zumurraya. Mr. Villaseñor is the one who has forgotten history and is now making an attempt to distort the facts.

In the third paragraph of his speech Mr. Villaseñor condemns "sectarian sheets" in the United States for the publicity they have given to the extremes of religious persecution practiced in Mexico. Does he consider the New York Times a sectarian sheet? This newspaper printed an authentic report of the murder and assault on innocent men, women, and children at Guadalajara, Mexico. Does he consider S. L. A. Marshall, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, a "sectarian" when he says that in Mexico religious freedom has ceased to exist? And, finally, does he regard Robert Hammond Murray, who has written a splendid series of articles in Today and has published several letters in the New York Times, as a partisan and "sectarian" when he describes the facts of the present persecution in Mexico? None of these gentlemen can be charged with having any tinge of Catholic bias.

In the fourth paragraph of his speech Mr. Villaseñor criticizes books which have been published on this subject. The two books that have been referred to most frequently and favorably by the American press are: First, Chaos in Mexico, by Dr. Charles S. McFarland; and, second, Blood-Drenched Altars, by Bishop Kelley, of Oklahoma. As far as I am aware, not a single fact related in either of the two books has ever been effectively refuted by the Mexican Government.

Mr. Villaseñor does give a summary in brief of the amendment to article 3 of the constitution of Mexico. This statement proves the contradiction to the principles of the natural law upon which the Constitution of the United States was predicated. It reads as follows:

1. Education shall be provided by the state.
2. Education shall be socialistic, divorced from all religious doctrines, and shall combat fanaticism and prejudice in such a way that school activities will create in Mexican youth a rational concept of the world and social life.
3. Only Federal, State, and municipal authorities shall have the right to give primary-, secondary-, or normal-school education.
4. Religious groups of ministers will be forbidden to interfere directly with primary-, secondary-, or normal-school education.
5. The formulation of educational programs shall be entirely under the state control.
6. No private school may function without State authority.
7. Primary education for children shall be compulsory and provided free by the state.

What Mr. Villaseñor fails to note is that this series of laws in itself is a persecution and a species of tyranny.

Mr. Villaseñor asks the following question: "Does non-religious teaching necessarily imply antireligious education?" To that I answer by revealing the blasphemous version of the "Our Father", that prayer dear to the heart of all who believe in God in His Heaven, which was published in *Christo Rey*, an official publication of the Government while Garrido Canabal was Minister of Agriculture.

"Our Father, who art not in heaven", for there is neither a God nor any question of sanctity to say nothing of saints—only imbeciles believe in them—"I mock and blaspheme You. May Your kingdom never arrive, pure and upright, and let Your will accomplish itself in burning statues and hanging ministers of religion and in destroying all churches both in the country and in the city."

Apparently Mr. Villaseñor is unaware of the fact that the United States Supreme Court has declared that the parent primarily has the right of education of the child and that the child, in this historic decision, is not a mere creature of the State.

It is a lie that Mexico has had to conquer Catholic resistance at every move toward social progress. Every attack upon the Catholic Church in Mexico during the past 200 years has coincided with a lowering of the standard of living and abridgement of liberty, and has retarded social progress. To give only one example, there was established over 100 years ago one of the most beautiful, a most splendidly equipped and charitably inspired orphanage, by Bishop Cabañas in Guadalajara, Mexico. This saintly prelate begged alms to erect this orphanage for the abandoned boys and girls of Mexico, traveling on foot from the jungles of Yucatan to the arid, desertlike plain of Sonora. Now 100 years after his death, in an institution built by Christian charity and inspired, if any institution in the world was ever inspired, by the love of God, it is not permitted to mention religion or to speak of goodness, conscience, or divine love. If you visit the orphanage of Padre Cabañas today you will find not a single emblem of religion; you will be greeted by no hymn in praise of the Deity. No words of the supernatural life are spoken within the precincts of that charitable institution originally consecrated to the love of God. On the contrary, children are paraded before you singing with pathetic accent the ribald songs of the streets, and the cheap tunes of the jazz age, "I love you, I hate you, I could kill you, kissing you."

The Cabañas orphanage and others like it built through the sacrifice of religious and laymen throughout Mexico in past centuries are now the object of destruction and fanatical attack inspired by those who undertake to speak for the poor and the dispossessed. They show their love for the poor by destroying their orphanages which have served to ameliorate their condition and care for the children of the poor throughout the centuries, when the radicals and their kind were too busily engaged in furthering their own interests at the expense of their fellows to join in giving alms for the relief of the unfortunate.

Toward the end of his address Mr. Eduardo Villaseñor has the audacity to claim that not a single one of the 50,000 federal employees of the present administration have been discharged on account of religion. He disregards entirely the authentic report carried by the Associated Press and other national press services last October—which gave the names and the number of those internes and nurses who had been discharged from their positions in hospitals because of their refusal to take part in an anti-God demonstration of the Mexican Government.

However, in order to give the lie direct to this charge and to put on record something which 20 years ago would have horrified the people of the world, I am going to give the names of two eminent world-renowned artists and scholars who, simply because they failed to march in the atheistic demonstration of the Mexican Government, were discharged from their positions. I refer to Don Frederigo Mariscal, chief architect of the National Palace of Fine Arts in Mexico City, celebrated in artistic circles throughout the world

for his genius and honored universally for his noble character. The second was a Protestant, Dr. Alonzo Caso, the most gifted archeologist in the employ of the Federal Government, a gentleman who accompanied the party which exhibited the jewels, found in the State of Oaxaca, on a triumphal tour of the United States. Dr. Caso exhibited the archeological treasures of his native land in the Pennsylvania Station in New York City and in the Union Station in the city of Washington. He has many friends in the United States and also in Europe and South America. Here were two outstanding artists and scholars whose names I furnish for your records and who are known everywhere for their genius and scholarship. They were dismissed from their positions because of their refusal to join in a demonstration against the sacred majesty of God. This was one of the most criminal blows struck at the ideals of art, culture, and religion in the whole history of mankind.

On the last page of his address the Mexican consul general states that the Mexican Embassy in Washington gave a statement to the press on February 28, 1935, denying that the Government of Mexico has ever authorized any Federal board of education or any single one of its teachers throughout the Republic to compel anybody, either teacher or pupil, to sign the pledge which appeared in American newspapers. Once more I refer to the book by Dr. Charles S. McFarland. His researches verified the oath. I also refer you to the text of the oath administered in the State of Michoacan to teachers throughout the State and countersigned by the federal inspector of education:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ Age _____
 Civil condition _____
 Normal school graduate or not _____
 Name of institution _____
 I. Declaration of adherence to article 3 of the constitution (socialistic education).
 II. Declaration of purpose to inculcate doctrines of socialism of the Republic.
 III. I declare my purpose to teach without reservation the postulates and principles as they are proposed by the National Government.
 IV. I declare absolutely that I do not profess either the Catholic faith or any other religion.
 V. I declare absolutely that I will combat by all possible means the efforts of the Catholic clergy and all other ministers of religion.
 VI. I declare absolutely that I will not practice any act of religion, interior or exterior, be it of the Catholic Church or any other religion.

Place and date _____

(Signature of teacher)

The inspector of federal education who affixes his name must ascertain that the above signature is the one employed by the teacher in all his official business.

(Signature of inspector)

There are photostatic copies of these oaths in Washington and in Baltimore showing the names the teachers have signed and also the name the inspector of education has signed.

In other words, Mr. Villaseñor will have to furnish us with something better than mere denials of these facts that have been vouched for by the highest authority and reported by eye witnesses of these events which clearly establish the opposition of the Mexican Government to religious liberty and the love of God.

H. R. 7810, TO AMEND THE NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY LAW

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill H. R. 7810, a bankruptcy act which I introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is submitted with respect to H. R. 7810, in the nature of an act to amend the national bankruptcy law.

Let me explain at the outset that the bill I have introduced is not an amendment to any bill heretofore introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] nor designed in any way to interfere with the operation of the Frazier-Lemke Act; but, on the other hand, to make

it possible for that act to be more generally availed of by those desiring to obtain its benefits.

One of the objects of the bill is to derive for the Government a return for the expense being incurred by the Government in administering the bankruptcy law. The bill, if passed, will enable the Treasury to get its share of a large volume of expenditures flowing in other directions. When the national bankruptcy law was passed in 1898 the creditor class, which was responsible for the drafting of the law, desired to make the expense of the administration thereof as low as possible. To that end it was provided in the law that the United States should obtain the benefit of a docket fee paid to the clerk of the court. No matter how long the estate remained in court, nor how many orders were entered therein, nor how much money was disbursed in the proceeding, the return to the Government could not exceed the docket fee. The clerk received a salary and paid his fees into the Treasury. So the entire sum of \$10 in each and every proceeding was the sum total of the amount realized by the Government. For example, a case was recently argued in the Supreme Court of the United States arising under section 74 in which the Government realized only the docket fee of \$10, and the referee was paid \$20,000. The referee is now claiming an additional compensation of \$110,000, but there is no way by which the Government can claim for itself more than the original \$10. In one case pending in Maryland, a holding corporation owns large blocks of stocks in several transcontinental railway systems. The assets amount to several hundred millions of dollars, and the costs taxed in favor of the Government under section 77 of the present law will be \$130. In the many bankruptcy proceedings pending in the United States, thousands of dollars are being paid out in the fees or receivers, trustees, referees, attorneys, bondholders' committees, reorganization managers, and investment bankers, while the amount received by the Government which provides the machinery by which the desired results are accomplished is a mere pittance. In the meantime the Government is called upon to pay the salaries of judges, of deputy clerks, and other officials, and to pay out large sums of money by way of stationery and other expenses. Subdivision (a) of the proposed bill will remedy this state of affairs.

Subdivision (b) is administrative of the provisions contained in subdivision (a).

Subdivision (c) is of especial importance in cases arising under sections 74 and 75 where the principal assets are usually covered by mortgages in excess of the value thereof. The effect of subdivision (c) is to make the allowances for costs, especially attorneys' fees, also wages deemed preferential under section 64 (b) payable out of the estate prior to the mortgage on the assets.

Subdivision (d) provides for the payment of certain costs in the circumstances therein stated out of the United States Treasury. Subdivision (d) is the only provision in the bill which calls for an expenditure of public funds. It is believed that the amount which may be paid into the Treasury under subdivisions (a) and (b) of the act, will be largely in excess of the amount paid out under subdivision (d) and may be more than sufficient to pay the total expense incurred by the Government in administering the bankruptcy law in its entirety, leaving a surplus to the Government.

Subdivision (e) is applicable only to individuals. It is to the interest of society that insolvent individuals be financially rehabilitated. This principle is the justification of the national bankruptcy law. Under the present law an insolvent individual is given permission to file proceedings under sections 74 or 75, but in many cases is entirely without funds with which to obtain this relief. The result is that attorneys confronted with the problems of existence and interested in earning a living are not giving attention to the bankruptcy law; hence insolvent debtors are not able to obtain adequate professional assistance and are practically denied the benefit of the present bankruptcy laws.

Subdivision (f) is important with respect to claims for personal injuries, including injuries resulting in death, and

claims for workmen's compensation. The general bankruptcy law was written from a commercial point of view and did not make any provision for the allowance of such claims against the estate of a bankrupt. An effort was made to remedy this omission in section 4 of the act of June 7, 1934. But as written that section seems to mean that if a person is injured, that thereafter the wrongdoer is adjudicated a bankrupt and the injured person thereafter dies the claim is not provable. In other words, the death must occur before the adjudication in order to make the claim therefor provable.

As to other damages, that is, damages for personal injury other than workmen's compensation, under clause 6½ of section 4, a cause of action for negligence under that clause is not provable as a claim against the estate of a bankrupt unless a suit was pending against the bankrupt at the time the petition was filed. Under the act of June 18, 1934, such claims were not provable in any proceeding in bankruptcy which had not been finally closed, but which had been pending for more than 6 months.

Subdivision (g) fixes a time within which claims arising under section (f) may be provable.

Subdivision (h) is applicable to claims of the character specified in subdivision (f); that is, claims for personal injuries, death arising therefrom, and workmen's compensation. These claims are made payable in full under the proposed bill prior to outstanding liens or mortgages.

Subdivision (i) is intended to cover an attempted evasion of subdivisions (f) and (h). If such an attempt is made by filing a suit in equity in which provision is not made for the payment of the claims now being discussed, then such omission is made an act of bankruptcy. So that it would be possible, in case of such evasion, to then have the debtor adjudicated a bankrupt and thus make subdivisions (f) and (h) fully operative.

Subdivision (j) makes it clear that the provisions of the bill are retroactive.

No attempt has been made in this statement to argue the justice or the propriety of the proposed bill. That task will be reserved until the committee to which the bill is referred shall have made its report thereon.

APPLICATIONS FOR LOANS UNDER HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 332) to provide an additional period of time within which to file applications for loans under the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 332

Joint resolution to provide an additional period of time within which to file applications for loans under the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence in subsection (c) of section 4 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In order to provide for applications heretofore filed, for applications filed within 60 days after this amendment takes effect, and for carrying out the other purposes of this section, the Corporation is authorized to issue bonds in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$4,750,000,000, which may be exchanged as herein-after provided, or which may be sold by the Corporation to obtain funds for carrying out the purposes of this section or for the redemption of any of its outstanding bonds; and the Corporation is further authorized to increase its total bond issue for the purpose of retiring its outstanding bonds by an amount equal to the amount of the bonds to be so retired (except bonds retired from payments of principal on loans), such retirement to be at maturity or by call or purchase or exchange or any method prescribed by the Board with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no bonds issued under this subsection, as amended, shall have a maturity date later than 1952."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know if there is not someone on the majority side who is going to object to consideration by unanimous consent of such an extended resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. The only change which the resolution makes in the present law is to extend the time from 30 days to 60 days.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York withhold his objection to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly I will withhold the objection to permit the gentleman to make a statement, but I assure the gentleman I am going to object.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the only change this resolution will effect will be to extend the period within which applications may be filed from 30 days to 60 days. The bill passed by Congress became effective on May 28 and provided that applications might be filed for 30 days after the effective date of the act. This time expires on June 27. I have heard from my part of the country that people who might possibly desire to make applications for loans are not aware of the fact that the time expires so soon. My purpose in introducing this resolution is to have the time extended to July 27 in order that those who are not informed and who are not aware of their rights may have that opportunity to file their applications.

An article appearing in this morning's paper indicates that there is plenty of money left to take care of these applications. At the time the act was passed we expected 160,000 mortgagors would file applications, but up to the 13th of this month only 33,545 applications had been filed. It was expected that the entire sum of \$1,750,000,000 would be used, but, as a matter of fact, the applications filed up to this time will take but \$1,100,000,000. So there is ample money to take care of further applications, and my desire is simply that we afford the people of the country who want to take advantage of this act ample time within which to file their applications.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Every word in the resolution is the present law except the one change from 30 days to 60 days. Is not this correct?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. But in order to comply with the technicalities of drafting legislation the gentleman had to repeat the language of the present law in his resolution.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is the only change brought about by the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation and has been on the statute books only 20 days. If an amendment of the law is necessary, the amendment should be considered by the proper committee and go through the regular channels.

Mr. Speaker, I object to taking up the matter in this way.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TEXAS CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 264. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 131, a joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebration to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, etc. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Andrews, N. Y.	Dorsey	McClellan	Ransley
Arends	Doutrich	McGroarty	Reece
Bacon	Ferguson	McLaughlin	Rogers, N. H.
Bankhead	Fish	McLean	Russell
Brown, Ga.	Flannagan	Martin, Colo.	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	Focht	May	Sadowski
Buckley, N. Y.	Fulmer	Mead	Schaefer
Bulwinkle	Gambrill	Merritt, Conn.	Schneider
Cavichia	Gassaway	Miller	Sears
Celler	Gifford	Mitchell, Ill.	Seger
Chapman	Gildea	Montet	Shannon
Clark, Idaho	Goldsborough	Moritz	Sisson
Clark, N. C.	Gray, Pa.	Murdock	Smith, Conn.
Cochran	Haines	Nichols	Smith, Va.
Collins	Hancock, N. C.	O'Connell	Stubbs
Cooley	Hartley	Oliver	Tobey
Cooper, Ohio	Hook	Patman	Tolan
Costello	Kerr	Perkins	Turner
Cummings	Kopplemann	Peterson, Fla.	Underwood
Dear	Lamneck	Pettengill	Whelchel
DeRouen	Larrabee	Peyser	Wilcox
Dickstein	Lea, Calif.	Plumley	Wilson, Pa.
Dingell	Lemke	Polk	
Dirksen	Luckey	Ramsay	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. DIES, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TEXAS CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I shall consume only a few minutes of the time of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule to permit consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 131, which has passed the Senate, and which authorizes the appropriation of \$3,000,000 for participation by the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition. The State of Texas has already raised approximately \$9,000,000. The legislature appropriated \$3,000,000, and the city of Dallas raised \$6,000,000. We are asking the Federal Government to cooperate in this great exposition to commemorate the historic period of the State of Texas to the extent of an authorization of \$3,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a local matter, because the heroic fathers who established the Republic of Texas came from practically every State in the Union. It is therefore a national matter; and as such, we come to the House asking its cooperation.

There is not in the State of Texas or in the House of Representatives a man more familiar with the history of Texas than my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], nor is there a spokesman so ideal and so fitting for this particular occasion than he. [Applause.] I therefore yield to my very dear friend and our most distinguished colleague [Mr. LANHAM] such time as he may require. [Applause.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the rule now before us makes in order a measure to provide for Federal participation in a celebration in which every American may justly take pride. Accordingly, that participation should be adequate to effectuate the purposes which inspire it. The exposition to be held in Texas is not an ordinary one; it is distinctly unique. In the history of our country there has been no celebration similar or analogous to it. It marks the observance of the centennial anniversary of a successful American struggle for independence. It commemorates the formation of a republic which was subsequently and amicably absorbed by another republic. Indeed, I doubt if there can be found a counterpart of the history which prompts our present contemplation.

Unless you are familiar with various features of that history and its consequences, you cannot understand the considerations which urge the adoption of this authorization

for an appropriation of \$3,000,000. The time at my disposal is too brief for their thorough discussion, but I wish as tersely as I may to bring to your attention four phases of this proposal:

In the first place, I would impress upon you that the history to be celebrated is in no way provincial. It is definitely and comprehensively American. Secondly, I would acquaint you with the important significance of that history to the United States in the acquisition and development of practically one-third of its territory. [Applause.] I would show you, in the third place, what the State of Texas has done and is doing to make this centennial celebration a success, and, fourthly, some of the ways in which the Federal Government may appropriately participate.

In the early part of the last century Moses Austin, a Connecticut Yankee, an outstanding American with a vision of the possibilities of our new Nation, conceived the idea of an American colony in Texas, then a vast area under the domination and control of Mexico. Because of the handicaps he encountered and the hardships he endured in that undeveloped empire, he passed away before his work was completed. It remained for his son, Stephen F. Austin, under difficulties insurmountable to a spirit less intrepid, to carry on the enterprise successfully and to become by popular acclaim "the father of Texas."

The families that constituted that first colony came from various States of the American Union as that Union then existed. Subsequent colonies were of similar American origin. These rugged pioneers were not mere adventurers. Some of them had served in the Congress of the United States. Some had occupied high judicial and professional positions. They were broad-minded Americans, typical of the best character of their respective sections, carrying with them to their new home American principles and American ideals.

Their lot became a hard one, but time has sweetened for our country the uses of their adversity. Indignities were heaped upon them. They were harassed by the Mexican Government very much as the Thirteen Original Colonies had suffered at the hands of the mother country. Though the odds against them seemed overwhelming, they declared boldly their independence of Mexico. Nothing could daunt the spirit of such sturdy patriots. Of the 24 States then in the American Union 17 were represented among the signers of that declaration: Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Missouri, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Florida, Arkansas, and Mississippi.

Time does not permit me to recite in detail the valorous deeds which led to the establishment of the independence these brave Americans had declared, but I know you will pardon the mention of one or two glorious examples. You have all heard, but perhaps do not recognize as your own hallowed heritage, the story of the Alamo. That sacred shrine was held by less than 200 men under the command of William Barrett Travis, of Alabama. They were not native Texans. Most of the native Texans of those days were Indians and Mexicans. They were Americans from your States, your illustrious forefathers. They were surrounded by the overwhelming forces of the enemy. While there was still opportunity to get a message through the lines, Travis sent forth a letter. It was addressed to all Americans in the world, for these beleaguered heroes were Americans fighting in the cause of liberty. These are the words of that immortal message; hear them and see if you can surpass them anywhere in the treasured annals of any land, these stirring words sent from this scene of martyrdom to your people:

Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise the garrison are to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls.

[Applause.]

I shall never surrender or retreat.

Then I call on you in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and everything dear to the American character to come to our aid with

all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase the three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country. Victory or death.

[Applause.]

And within the walls of that Alamo every one of that heroic band attested the sincerity of those words with his life's blood. They were Americans all, Americans worthy of the name; Americans who came from your country; Americans like David Crockett, of Tennessee, who with his rifle, "Old Betsy", which had been given him by the Young Men's Club of Philadelphia, took abundant toll from the enemy [applause]; Americans like James Bowie, of Georgia, originator of the famous Bowie knife. [Applause.] Would that I had time to name them all and tell you whence they came! Would that I had time to speak of Goliad, where another massacre occurred through the perfidy which marked the campaign of Santa Anna, that self-styled "Napoleon of the West"; or of old Ben Milam, of Kentucky, who in the early stages of the conflict shouted the challenge: "Who will go with old Ben Milam into San Antonio?"

Within 2 months after the fall of the Alamo a small but unyielding band of American patriots faced at San Jacinto the oncoming hordes of the foe. With the opposing armies in position, "Deaf" Smith announced that he had cut down the bridge which could serve as the enemy's only source of retreat. That was to be the finishing fight in this struggle for American independence. There on the 21st day of April 1836 these soldiers of freedom from all our States, unmindful of the fearful odds against them, rushed forth shouting the slogan which inspired them, "Remember the Alamo! Remember Goliad!" They were led by the immortal Sam Houston, that distinguished son of the Old Dominion, whose career is without a parallel in history. The superior numbers of the enemy were of no avail. Those stalwart Americans under Houston could not be vanquished. Their success was phenomenal, but their victory complete. The Alamo and Goliad had been avenged and in our beloved America a new republic was born.

It is said that, with his cherished dream of an empire in the great Southwest, this startling triumph led the dejected Aaron Burr to exclaim, "I was 30 years too soon!"

It has been truly said, "Thermopylae had its messenger of defeat; the Alamo had none." [Applause.] In a similar way some day a coiner of epigrams may suitably and tersely epitomize the battle of San Jacinto, but its significance to America seems to transcend the power of words.

And so in 1836 this continent of ours boasted another American Republic. It had its flag, its Constitution, its Congress. For 9 years it survived with a history in keeping with its glorious origin. It was recognized by four foreign governments; and the old French Embassy, constructed largely of materials brought from France, still stands in the capital city. Who was its first President? David G. Burnet, of New Jersey. Who was its last President? Anson Jones, of Massachusetts, who, in my opinion, was more responsible than any other American for the admission of Texas into the Union. Another of our great Presidents was Mirabeau B. Lamar, of Georgia, the founder of our system of education. The lack of proper educational opportunities had been one of the dominant causes of the revolt against Mexico. For our system in Texas, Mirabeau B. Lamar gave a slogan which I think all men might well bear in mind:

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free men acknowledge and the only security that free men desire.

[Applause.]

I must hurry on, but again I would remind you that men of such stamp and caliber, coming from your States, were responsible for this wonderful history. There is so much that could be told. Why, at the Battle of San Jacinto the pieces of artillery upon which these unconquerable Americans relied were two cannon, called "The Twin Sisters", which had been contributed to the cause by the citizens of Cincinnati. [Applause.] Every section of our Nation shares with glory and honor in the outstanding accomplishment which we Americans would celebrate.

Now, what has been the result of this history—and if you will read it you will find it as glorious as any that has been recorded, and it is yours, peculiarly yours?

With the admission of Texas into the American Union 389,166 square miles were added to the domain of Old Glory, and this territory included parts of five other States as they now exist: Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado.

The Mexican Government did not officially recognize the independence of Texas, which had been wrested from Santa Anna, the dictator, and it served notice upon the United States of America that the admission of this new republic as a State would be regarded as a cause of war. The boundaries were not definitely fixed and the disputes which arose from this controversy led to the War with Mexico. Out of that conflict, attributable directly to that struggle for independence on the soil of Texas, our country brought within its borders the States of California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and parts of Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

If you will look upon this map you will see outlined in blue that portion of our country which was acquired directly and immediately as the result of the Texan victory; and if you will look upon this vast expanse of western territory, here also enclosed in blue, you will find the other States I have enumerated which are now proudly American because of the service your fathers rendered in Texas in a gallant fight for freedom. In other words, the land added to the United States, land now rich in men and material, by the patriotic heroism of Americans in Texas, is greater in area than that acquired by the terms of the Louisiana Purchase. But there is a more important and significant difference than mere size. There could never attach to an acquisition by barter and sale the scintillating glory in which we bask because of the fact that they who have given us our birthright shed their blood in wrestling from tyranny the right of Americans in one-third of our territory to live under our free institutions. [Applause.]

Now, in 1903 an exposition was held in St. Louis commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, and I think you will find that the Federal Government appropriated for that celebration more than \$6,000,000. We are now asking for only one-half that sum for a centennial celebration of this glorious and peculiarly American history, based not upon the gains of purchase but upon the accomplishments of patriotic Americans from all over our land who brought us a greater gift bought by their sacrifice in preserving the teachings and traditions of American ideals.

We want you and the people of your States to become familiar with this history. We want you to know about Texas and this great western empire to which I have referred. The more we know of our country the more we love it. It is all ours. And we want the foreign governments to participate, because they, too, had a part in our origin and development. Texans can never forget the brave and liberty-loving men of Spanish blood who aided so loyally in establishing the independence of that new Republic of Texas. North, South, East, and West may feel equally at home in that beautiful Lone Star State.

Now, what has Texas done to make this celebration a success? In the first place, it was impossible for the Legislature of Texas to make an appropriation for this purpose without an amendment to our constitution. Accordingly, a constitutional amendment was submitted to authorize this expenditure and it was carried by a very substantial majority. In pursuance of that authority the legislature has appropriated \$3,000,000 for this centennial celebration. During the depression Texas has suffered like other States, and I am sure you will agree readily that it has not been niggardly in doing its part to commemorate this glorious chapter of American history.

Naturally there will be celebrations at several of our shrines, but the principal exhibits are to be shown in Dallas because there we have one of the largest State fairs in the Nation, comprising 170 acres, with many permanent buildings already available for some purposes of the exposition. The value of this property has been appraised at \$3,500,000.

Through an issue of bonds the city of Dallas has contributed an additional \$3,500,000. And then, the Central Exposition Corporation has authorized bonds in the sum of \$2,500,000. I am advised that these have been sold, with the exception of \$500,000, and that the entire amount will be available in 60 days. In money and land and buildings, therefore, Texas is devoting about \$13,000,000 to this centennial celebration. I have no desire whatever to make any comparison in a disparaging sense, but I believe it will be found that the money and property available in advance for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, exclusive of the Federal appropriation, was not so great.

We come now to consider some of the ways in which the Federal Government may appropriately participate. It is practically impossible at this time to foresee and enumerate them all because of the comprehensive nature of the events we are to celebrate. In their various aspects they are military, naval, civil, agricultural, industrial, historical, and so forth.

The resolution provides for a Federal commission to be composed of the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Agriculture. They are able, honest, and faithful men who may be depended upon to keep the expenditures within proper bounds and to devote the funds under their supervision to purposes appropriate to the celebration. Because of the many phases of the history and development and progress involved I think they should be allowed some latitude in the exercise of their discretion.

In the first place, there will be the matter of Federal exhibits and proper building for their display. In the archives in Washington there must be many documents and other material connected with the history of that early period. Then there will be the costs of administration and transportation and other necessary incidental items which must arise with reference to appropriate exhibits.

Let me remind you that Texas is the only State in the Union that ever had a navy. This was during the war for independence and the days of the Republic. So effective was that navy that in that epochal conflict neither Mexican soldiers nor supplies were ever landed on our shores along the extensive coast of the Gulf. When the Republic was admitted into the Union the navy came with it. It seems, therefore, that it would be most appropriate to have during the centennial some proper naval display at ports of the Texas coast.

No exposition in this country has ever fittingly shown the story of cotton. In the ramifications of the industry cotton has produced, every part of our land has an abiding interest. In the southwestern section where the fleecy staple abounds, the Department of Agriculture may well exemplify every phase of the growth, cultivation, harvesting, manufacturing, and marketing of this basic commodity and demonstrate the possibilities of improvement from each of these important angles.

Similar considerations urge attention to the livestock industry in which the West and Southwest are so peculiarly interested. In my home city of Fort Worth is held annually the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, with much equipment and many facilities available to promote progress in this industry which plays so large a part both in our subsistence and our trade.

At San Antonio, the city of the Alamo, is one of our largest military posts. Some appropriate military celebration may be devised in honor of the sacred shrine that city boasts, and Goliad and San Jacinto may well call for similar commemoration of our martial history.

In no exposition have the colored people of our country had an opportunity to show the development of their race and the contributions they have made to America. Within a radius of 600 miles of the exposition live 4,500,000 negroes. They have had much to do with many phases of southern industry and agriculture. Those in control are arranging a building for their exhibits, the plans of which have been designed by Negro architects, and the interest of the colored people is manifested by the fact that they have underwritten

a part of the expense of this undertaking. There will be an appropriate hall for the concerts of their choral societies and other artists. If you have never heard their singing, you have a treat in store for you. With reference to the exhibits and other features of this phase of the celebration the Federal Government could appropriately find ways to participate.

In the field of educational exhibits the national government could be most helpful in teaching the people of our country the wonderful history to which I have alluded. Americans fought in Texas that their children might have educational advantages, and their further solicitude for the women and children of our land is exemplified in the fact that Texas gave to the Nation its first homestead law, affording a protection and security upon which the prosperity and happiness of our people must always depend. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I could talk at great length. I have not had time to deal with the mechanical arts or the various elements of progress and development since the establishment of Texan independence or of the many commercial advantages which may come to all the people from the celebrations planned. I have sought briefly to call attention to four considerations: First, that this is an American exposition and that there has never been anything like it in the history of our country. Secondly, that in its consequences it has brought to the United States, through the struggles and sufferings of free Americans who loved our institutions, more territory than was acquired by the Louisiana Purchase. Thirdly, I have tried to show that the State of Texas is seeking to do its full part in a proper commemoration of the history which is our mutual heritage.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman, in my opinion, is making a very fine historical speech. The gentleman has made reference to the amount of money the State of Texas is going to contribute. How much money will the State of Texas get from the Public Works Administration fund, and how much of that financial obligation will they assume?

Mr. LANHAM. It will get no more than its proper allotment from that fund. I do not know how that can affect the purpose of this celebration. If it is to take men off the relief rolls and give them employment, and if it has that effect and some of the money should be used in the exposition—

Mr. SWEENEY. I make the observation because I believe in times like these there are many more practical ways of spending money than for a sentimental purpose.

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, I think one trouble with us is that we have not been given, as we should have been given, to this thing of sentiment. [Applause.] Let us remember the sources from which we sprang. Let us remember the fathers who by their patriotism have made us great. Let us remember the many battles they won and strive to be worthy successors of them. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I can join with my distinguished and worthy friend from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] in glorifying the deeds of those who founded the Texas Republic. It is true, Texas has contributed some of the most colorful pages in American history. No one would deny credit to anyone who was responsible for the founding of Texas, but we are not here today to measure in dollars our patriotism or sentiment. I am not opposing the rule which will bring this resolution before the House. I am not opposing legislation that provides a contribution on the part of the National Government to this great celebration to be held in the Lone Star State next year. I believe the Government should contribute toward that exposition, but in the interest of the taxpayer, in the interest of the American people who must pay these bills, I think Congress must consider well the amount we appropriate. How much are we going to give for this exposition? I assumed an obligation when the Speaker appointed me a year ago as a member of the Texas commission, and also

as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which considered this bill; this obligation requires me to make a report to Congress. At no time has it come under my observation when any figures have been presented which would merit an appropriation of \$3,000,000.

It is true, in these extravagant days this appropriation may be car-fare money, but it is not going to be car-fare money to the American people as the days go by; when we are obliged to renew nuisance taxes; when we are obliged to place new tax burdens on the American people. Waiving aside sentiment, I believe when anyone comes to Congress and asks for \$3,000,000 they ought to show where that money is going to be expended. What will the Government get? What form will the Government's contribution be? No one knows. No one even knows in what city in Texas the money will be spent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My friend realizes that this is an authorization bill and that the Committee on Appropriations, when it makes the appropriation, will go into a hearing with reference to what these various items should be.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is an easy road to ruin. You come here and say this is only an authorization, and we pass it easily. Then a little later you come and say Congress has authorized this amount, and the Appropriations Committee should appropriate the amount of money stipulated. I, too, want to protect those two valiant men from Texas on the Appropriations Committee. I do not want to place the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] in the unfortunate position of being obliged to curtail the appropriation for his own State. [Laughter and applause.] I do not want to make it embarrassing for that other great watchdog of the Treasury, Mr. BLANTON, to be obliged to say that Texas cannot have this amount of money. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman realizes that my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. TABER, of New York, is another one of those watchdogs?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes; but unfortunately he is in the minority and his way will not prevail.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. The gentleman mentioned the great watchdog of the Treasury, Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know that when the San Diego Exposition bill was being considered the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said that \$100,000 was enough for any exposition? [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will say for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that he is a good watchdog and he is performing a great service. He is doing well. I expect his strong voice will yet ring out here in support of my proposal that the amount be reduced.

I am a little more liberal than most of the Members on this side and perhaps some on the other side. I would give a million and a half. That is very liberal. Seriously, I say in perfectly good spirit, San Diego came here a while ago and asked for Federal recognition for its exposition. They had appropriated and raised \$12,000,000. We gave them, I think, \$350,000. I correct myself. We did not give \$350,000. We appropriated that amount for a Government exhibit. That is a vast difference. We did not give California a single nickel.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. That is the same thing they are asking for here.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We do not know it.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, the gentleman does know it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No; there is no evidence to show it.

Mr. BLOOM. But the resolution calls for that. This is for a Government exhibit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all it says. There is nothing mandatory about appropriating it for a Government exhibit. Will the gentleman accept an amendment prohibiting that anything be spent except for a Government exhibit?

Mr. BLOOM. As far as I am concerned, it is not my resolution, but that is what this resolution calls for.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not yield further, because there is nothing in the resolution which says it will only be spent for an exhibit. Permit me to continue. There was a world's fair out in Chicago. I see the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] is interested. The best that Mr. SABATH could get was \$1,000,000. When he came back the next year he had difficulty in getting an additional \$250,000.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. SABATH. Now, the gentleman knows that the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has stated many times to our committee that he is not bound by any amount that is authorized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And I admire him for making that statement.

Mr. SABATH. As I have the utmost confidence in the gentleman from Texas, that he will not vote out any more than is absolutely necessary, especially in this case, I know he will hold it down to the very last penny.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does the gentleman know it?

Mr. SABATH. Of course, we all have the utmost confidence in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN]. He will see that not any more is appropriated than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is aware of the fact that to celebrate the Louisiana Purchase the Federal Government contributed more than \$6,000,000?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Two wrongs do not make a right. That was 30 years ago. Perhaps money was easier in those days. Perhaps there was not in evidence then the great threat of heavy taxation in the immediate future. That must be considered when we make appropriations at the present time.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Section 7 of this resolution authorizes an appropriation of \$3,000,000 and authorizes the commissioners to expend this money, to use that money and any other money subsequently authorized or appropriated or to make any expenditure or allotment deemed necessary by it to fulfill properly the purposes of this joint resolution, and to allocate such sums to the Texas Centennial Commission and the Texas Centennial Central Exposition for expenditure by such bodies in any part of the State of Texas as the commission deems necessary and proper in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. So there is nothing there about Government exhibits at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The resolution is so wide open you could drive a pair of Texas steers right through it.

Mr. KLEBERG. I listened with some interest to the repetition of the history of Texas, which history, of course, I, too, know; and I was interested a moment ago when the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested an amendment limiting the expenditure of Federal funds only to a Federal exhibit at the exposition. I am wondering if the gentleman cannot find in his heart a sufficient Americanism to recognize that were \$3,000,000 expended in the erection of monuments alone to keep alive the worship of the heroes who gave this country to us, the spending would not be for a better purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I can appreciate the splendid spirit prompting the gentleman's statement, but we are fast getting into the era when we cannot afford a champagne appetite. The erection of monuments and beautiful buildings is not justified unless it puts people to work; this

is especially true at a time when people are hungry and when we are going to be called upon continually to spend millions and even billions of dollars for the relief of the American people. We must conserve carefully our resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the rule. I hope the rule will be adopted, but I do hope when we go into the Committee and consider this legislation we will give the taxpayers "a break" for once this year.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 131, providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 131, with Mr. GILLETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the Senate joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, does the other side desire any general discussion of the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; Members on this side wish to be heard.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I hardly thought it was necessary to have further discussion, but Members on the other side seem to want it. I think the gentleman from Texas has fully presented the matter. The report of the committee was practically unanimous.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is an exceptional difference between the exposition and some others that have been held. As has been said, the city of Houston and the State of Texas are raising some \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 for the exposition. It is not a State exposition but is really a part of the history of the great West.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was impressed with the concluding remarks of my friend and distinguished colleague [Mr. LANHAM] in answer to the question whether this was not too much money to be spent for sentiment. I believe the trouble with our country at this time and for some years has been that we have grown so cynical and have been so actuated by the spirit of sordid commercialism that we have lost sight of the spirit of idealism and patriotism which actuated our fathers.

Mr. Chairman, this is not to be a commercial exposition; this is not an exposition prompted by an organization in some city or town in order to seek notoriety for their town or to bring business to that section. The celebration which will begin in June of 1936 commemorates the one hundredth anniversary of the independence of Texas. It is not commercial but historic, and is to commemorate the heroic and successful struggle of a small band of patriots against an enemy vastly superior in numbers. The idea of this celebration did not originate in Texas. The first suggestion that we have this celebration in 1936 came from a distinguished citizen of the State of New York—Mr. Theodore H. Price—who happened to be visiting in Texas. Being familiar with the history of our great State, he suggested in a speech he made there some 10 years ago that in 1936 we have a centennial exposition commemorating the birth of Texas. In response to the suggestion of this gentleman from New York, our people 10 years ago began to dream dreams of

this great exposition. For the past 10 years there has been activity among the various citizens of Texas in organizing for the celebration of this great event. Until 2 years ago the constitution of our State did not permit the State to make contributions of this kind.

Two years ago, however, the legislature submitted to the people of Texas for their vote the question of whether or not the constitution of the State should be so amended as to authorize the legislature to make this appropriation; and the people of Texas by a popular vote adopted the amendment and an appropriation of \$3,000,000 was made by the legislature for this centennial. I mention this that you may know it is not a small group who favor this exposition but that it is sponsored by the people of the entire State, who at the polls registered their willingness to tax themselves even in these hard times to have this exposition. The city and citizens of Dallas, as already pointed out, have also made liberal appropriations. So this celebration is not in response to a sudden impulse of a few but has been planned for years and has the endorsement of our entire State.

Mr. Chairman, we shall celebrate next year an event by which the United States secured 30½ percent of the present domain of the entire continental United States, taking into consideration the territory that came into Texas under the annexation and that which came as a result of the annexation of Texas and the war that followed in making effective the annexation.

When Texas was admitted into the Union under a resolution adopted by this Congress, the Mexican Government gave notice to our Government that if the treaty annexation was adopted by the Congress that would be tantamount to a declaration of war. The Congress of the United States in 1845 passed the resolution of annexation, and, as a result, the Mexican Government immediately recalled their Minister from Washington and severed all diplomatic relations with the United States. They began to make contentions about where the boundary line was, claiming that the boundary line should not be the Rio Grande but should be the Nueces River. As a result, war followed, and in that war Texas participated and the citizens of other States participated. There was annexed, because of this war, that vast territory which was shown on the map exhibited by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. The territory which came to this country through the annexation of Texas and cession from Mexico as a result of the War with Mexico, caused by the annexation of Texas, comprises 30½ percent of the present entire domain of the continental United States, and is larger than the entire United States in 1790.

Mr. Chairman, I have here some figures prepared from the Statistical Abstract, which gives the territorial expansion of the United States. In 1790 the territory of the United States comprised 892,135 square miles. The Louisiana Purchase in 1803 was 827,987 square miles. The acquisition of Florida in 1819 was 58,666 square miles. The annexation by the treaty with Spain in 1819 was 13,435 square miles. The annexation of Texas in 1845 was 389,166 square miles. The Oregon annexation in 1846 was 286,541 square miles. The Mexican cession in 1848 was 529,189 square miles. The Gadsden Purchase in 1853 was 29,670 square miles; making a total area of the continental United States 3,026,789 square miles.

Adding the area of Texas acquired by annexation with that ceded by Mexico increased our domain 918,355 square miles. Is not the celebration of an event which resulted in the acquisition of one-third of the domain of the United States worthy of recognition by the Federal Government?

Mr. Chairman, no State in the Union can have a celebration which will commemorate the acquisition of territory which amounted to nearly one-third of the entire domain of the United States. No other State in the American Union can have a celebration where it celebrates the annexation of a republic. When this resolution was heard by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House we had a most interesting and instructive hearing. At the conclusion of that hearing the motion to report this resolution did not come from the Democratic members of that committee but came from gentlemen on the other side, namely, the gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. It was so reported. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who has made some observations here in opposing the resolution, was not at the hearing, and I believe if he had been present and had heard the testimony in reference to the resolution he would have been heartily in favor of it, as the other members of the committee are who were there and heard the testimony at that time.

The people who founded Texas were not marauders. They were not buccaneers. They were men; they were brave men.

They were not only brave men, but among them were those who had held high positions in other States before their migration to Texas. Richard Ellis, the president of the constitutional convention, was a former associate justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama. George Campbell Childress, the author of the Texas declaration of independence, was a brilliant lawyer from Nashville, Tenn. A. H. Latimer was an able lawyer and a near relative of Hon. Henry Latimer, once United States Senator from Delaware. Sam Houston, the commander in chief of the Texas revolutionary forces, and afterward President of the Texas Republic, served in the Congress of the United States from Tennessee, and was once Governor of that great State. David Crockett, one of the martyrs of the Alamo, served in Congress from Tennessee. Samuel P. Carson, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, served for 8 years in the Congress of the United States from North Carolina, as did Robert Potter, also from North Carolina. Thomas J. Rusk studied law in the office of John C. Calhoun, in South Carolina, and was afterward chief justice of the Texas Supreme Court and later United States Senator from Texas. David G. Burnet, president ad interim of the Republic of Texas, was born in Newark, N. J., and his brother, Jacob Burnet, was a member of the Supreme Court of Ohio and afterward United States Senator from Ohio, and another brother was mayor of Cincinnati.

Moses Austin, one of the earliest pioneers, was from Connecticut, and his son and successor was Stephen F. Austin, born in Virginia, and whose statue and that of Sam Houston may now be seen in Statuary Hall of this Capitol. Anson Jones, the last President of the Republic of Texas, and whose efforts were largely instrumental in the annexation of Texas by the United States, was born in Great Barrington, Mass.

May I say that the constitutional convention met in the town of Washington on the Brazos, near the home of our friend the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. BUCHANAN.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this celebration is not alone ours. We want the people of the United States. We want the people in all the States to know that they had a part in this great chapter of the most colorful history in all the world. We want them to come to the State where that history was made and rejoice with us that the heroic sacrifices of their fathers made possible the empire of the great Southwest.

We want the people to know that the time has not come when we are willing to vote money only for commercialism. They talk about unemployment; this money will be spent to put people to work. The money to be expended under this resolution will give people jobs just as much as a great deal of the other legislation we have passed, and this money is not going to be turned over directly to Texas or to State officials down there, but will be expended under the direction of the members of a Federal commission, as provided in the resolution.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. How does the gentleman know what this commission is going to do with the money? The gentleman says they are not going to turn it over to the people down there, but as the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out a few minutes ago, they have the authority to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course, here is what will be done: This money will be expended by a Federal commission, and this commission is composed of the Vice President, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Agriculture. These four men represent the Federal Government in expending this money.

Mr. CARTER. Under this bill they have authority to allocate such sums as they desire to the Texas Centennial Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; the commission will have that authority.

Mr. CARTER. Would the gentleman subscribe to an amendment that would limit this committee in the expenditure of this money to the establishment of an exhibit of the United States Government there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is the purpose for which the money would be expended, and let me say to the gentleman, I am going to offer an amendment, which has been suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], and under this amendment we expect to establish in the city of Austin a museum to preserve the historic relics of Texas, and there is to be an appropriation for that purpose. This celebration is going to be State-wide, and while the main exposition is to be held in Dallas, there will be celebrations throughout the State. There will be a celebration at San Antonio, at the Alamo, where these men gave their lives in defense of liberty. There will be one at Houston near the battlefield of San Jacinto.

Mr. CARTER. I have no objection to the United States Government going, perhaps, into several cities and putting up a proper exhibit—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the reason we cannot restrict or limit the language.

Mr. CARTER. But your bill goes much further than that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. To what portion of the bill does the gentleman refer?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Page 6, line 4, the language provides that this commission consisting of four members, as the gentleman has enumerated, may allocate these funds to other commissions, and this money certainly would not be used to ones that will hold the celebrations throughout the State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the gentleman that the Federal commission can provide any such limitation as they want or think proper. These organizations are the ones that will hold the celebrations throughout the States and the Federal commission that will allocate this money. We may assume they will exercise this right in the interest of the Federal Government to make these allocations in an appropriate manner, so that the expenditures will be in harmony with the interests of the Federal Government and provide for an exhibit by the Federal Government itself.

Mr. CARTER. It is not my point that the expenditures will not be in harmony with the interests of the Federal Government. I think they should be expended for a Federal exhibit. This was the limitation put in the last bill of this kind that passed this House, and I think it is a very proper limitation.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. The provision referred to allocates such sums for expenditure by such bodies in any part of the State of Texas as the commission deems necessary and proper in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution and the joint resolution provides for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and the celebrations to be held in the State of Texas. So under this language the money is only to be spent for the purposes of this joint resolution.

Mr. CARTER. The joint resolution covers the entire purpose of this commission, of course.

I do not want to take the gentleman's time unduly, but there is one other question I should like to ask.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. I notice on page 3 the resolution provides for the appointment of a commissioner and one or more assistant commissioners.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the gentleman that we have a committee amendment limiting that to not more than three assistants.

Mr. CARTER. I think that is a very commendable amendment.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be enough public-spirited gentlemen in the State of Texas who would contribute their services to this great cause instead of having four positions of this kind, one at \$10,000 and three at \$7,500?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One or more of these men will probably be sent down there from Washington, and I do not know that Texas people will get all of these jobs, because there has to be one or more who are experienced in work of this kind.

Mr. MILLARD. They are to be appointed by the President?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; the commissioner general is so appointed and he selects his assistants.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. I am very much in sympathy with the purposes of this resolution. It is entirely fitting that our Government should recognize the annexation of the Republic of Texas, but would the gentleman be willing to reduce the appropriation from \$3,000,000 to \$2,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me say in reply to the gentleman that I think the Appropriations Committee, of which the gentleman is a member, will do that if they think it is necessary. The gentleman knows how jealously they guard appropriations, and while some comment was made about the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee being from Texas, I think those who know the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BUCHANAN], all realize that he is so conscientious with the Government's money that he would not let that sway him in any way.

In fact, as one gentleman said, speaking of Mr. BUCHANAN—someone asked if he thought he could get an appropriation, and the reply was, to use his own language, "Old Buck is pretty stingy with the Government's money." [Laughter.]

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I call this to the attention of my colleague, that because of the great ramifications of Texas history—military, naval, civil, industrial, agricultural, representatives from foreign governments—it is perhaps impossible in advance to know every little item of expense that may arise, but that the commission may be depended upon not to make allocations not in accordance with the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think so. I think the commission can be trusted to exercise its sound judgment.

Mr. REILLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. REILLY. I have been very much interested in this matter, and I want to ask the gentleman how much has been appropriated by the Federal Government for former expositions?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not that data before me, but for Chicago there was a million and a half. They had two expositions, and I think the money appropriated for both exceeds the amount asked for here. You must remember that we have had no celebration of this character. As my colleague has said, this is a patriotic event. The Louisiana Purchase was celebrated in 1903, and represented the acquisition of that territory; that was a barter and sale. This is a celebration of the acquisition of territory that was won by the blood and sacrifice of American citizens. I think there is quite a difference.

Mr. REILLY. What was the amount appropriated for the San Francisco exhibition?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. They have had several exhibitions. Let me say that I attended the exhibitions at San Francisco and San Diego, and I have enjoyed them all. There would have been no exhibition in any place if it had not been for this western territory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me say that the acquisition of Texas made it possible for California to be a State.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. Instead of scattering this exhibition about the State of Texas, why not have it held in Los Angeles? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANHAM. Let me say that Texas was a republic for 9 years before the acquisition of California, and California became a republic for only 9 days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to authorize the appropriation of \$3,000,000 to celebrate the achievements of the men who fought to free the land now comprised within the State of Texas from the Empire of Mexico and later made it one of the United States.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who spoke at some length in favor of the rule, and the gentleman who just closed, if my understanding of their remarks be correct, and we all agree with what they had to say, praised the deeds of the liberty-loving souls, the determination and the steadfastness of certain "rugged individuals" who so brought Texas into the Union. Listening to them, we did not hear anything about any "planned government" which accomplished that great feat. The reason is clear. Their achievements were those of individuals, not of a group which crushed initiative, which frowned upon, and sought to prohibit the progress of the individual, not of a planned government which knew neither patriotism nor kindness, but, in reality, only the advancement of the planners, which, under the guise of sympathy for the downtrodden or the average man, in the end, reduced him to a condition of servitude.

It is well that we remember their acts, that we emulate the spirit which inspired them, that to our respective States we render the loyal protection of local self-government for which they fought and died. Much has been, more will be, said in praise of the spirit which moved them, of the sacrifices which they made, of the great material good which has come to us through their acts.

If gentlemen are really asking for this appropriation of the taxpayers' money for the purpose of causing us to remember the principles which motivated these patriots to whom they so fittingly refer, to follow in their footsteps and to battle for our rights as individuals and as local governments entitled to govern themselves, it might be well to remember that the last Congress, and this Congress to almost as great an extent, has surrendered the rights so dearly won, to the executive branch of our Government; that we this session have time and again shown ourselves to be false to the principles for which those whom you now praise so highly, whom you love for their great deeds, gave their efforts; to remember that we, day after day, as a body, shirk the responsibility put upon us and that we are, through legislation, granting to a small group the powers sought to be exercised by the ruler of Mexico, whose yoke these men would not carry.

From the majority side and especially by the gentleman from Texas, that great statesman who so frequently reminds us of our duty to economize, who does not seem to be here at present, during this session, day following day and week after week, we on the Republican side have been reminded that the President received from the people, in the election of 1932, a mandate to carry out certain policies; that mandate had been confirmed in 1934.

We, as Republicans, have not forgotten the platform, the campaign promises, of the Democratic Party, of its candidate for the presidency. We recall that those promises have not been fulfilled. We are told from day to day that it was, and is, our patriotic duty to support the administration in all things. Time and again we have seen Members on the majority side whipped into line by bitter denunciation of their attempts to voice their individual convictions, to vote in accordance with their judgment. We have noted, not with surprise, but with sorrow, the scorching party lash which has beaten into subjection the would-be independent individual members of a great party. We realize that they are still hypnotized by the magnitude of the popular vote received in 1932, which they, as well as certain other gentlemen, have erroneously construed as an individual tribute to their candidate, but which was, in fact, in part due to dissatisfaction with the power obtained by the so-called "vested interests", in part to the shameful "smearing" of the Nation's then President, but to a far greater extent, to the fact that, prior to that campaign, party platforms, campaign promises, were, by the people, construed to be declarations of principle, a pledging of service in accordance with those declarations. To the fact that the voters believed, relied upon, that platform, those promises.

Misconstruing the causes of that victory, the party has betrayed those who gave it their support, and today we have, not a Democratic Party but a party of so-called "new dealers", an entirely different thing.

We on this side well know that you of the Democratic Party will, on every occasion, whenever you have an opportunity so to do, if you follow your course in the last and, so far, in this Congress, with but one exception, vote for the must measures, for the bills which have the administration's endorsement. This support of the administration one might say is given almost unconsciously, surely blindly, for many, many times, upon reflection, you must realize your error, and it is only when some group desires an appropriation of public funds or an increase of political positions that you venture to make your protests audible.

To our friends on the Republican side I make the request that today you join with me in supporting this President of ours in his efforts to economize; that we call the attention of the gentlemen who desire this appropriation of \$3,000,000 to the fact that they are repudiating their party platform, in that this bill will further increase expenditures above revenues.

We all know that, since 1932, many, many laws have been passed, hundreds, yes, thousands of rules and regulations have been promulgated, under the cloak of which hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees have been collected by Federal and other employees, all under the codes, all without authority of law. If the record be read correctly, practically all of the important laws so passed, all of the regulations and rules so made by bureaucrats, were passed upon the theory that a great emergency existed, that our country was in great distress, that children were starving and going naked, were cold, that the women were suffering from a lack of the necessities of life in the hamlets and the cities of our land, that men were out of jobs.

So, acting upon the thought that there actually existed a great national emergency, some of you joined with others not now here and passed all this legislation which permitted a government contrary to the principles of our Constitution, this legislation which the Supreme Court has so recently said was unconstitutional. The legislation was passed, and the oft-repeated excuse or reason for its passage, for the abdication by Congress of its power and its duty to legislate, for the shirking of a plain duty, was that it was necessary to prevent a revolution. The use of that term is no longer popular. It served its purpose. We no longer hear it. Its power of intimidation has gone. Its falsity has been demonstrated and it has been cast aside.

Beyond question, the Members of Congress voting for that legislation were sincere. Equally true is it that they were thoughtless, that the true condition of our country, the natural resourcefulness of our people, their ability to overcome

adversity was given no consideration whatever, or was underestimated.

Today we are asked to celebrate what? To celebrate the deeds of a planned society, the accomplishments of a planned economy? Oh, no! We are asked to celebrate the deeds of individuals, of those gentlemen who accomplished something because of their rugged individualism, men who acknowledged no master minds, neither in Mexico nor elsewhere.

Before we celebrate, why not for the moment support the President and some of the concededly good declarations of the Democratic platform? Why not get onto the Democratic bandwagon once and help them out? Always here, when we criticize, they have asked us to offer some constructive suggestion. Today the suggestion is offered that they follow their President in some of his statements. Here is one that might be taken into consideration when we are asked to appropriate this money and know, as we do, that we are continually borrowing and creating new deficits. In July of 1932, President Roosevelt, then Governor, said:

Let us have courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits.

Later, in October, he made this statement:

Now the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. * * * If, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing up to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continue to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Support your President? There are many things in which the Republicans would be only too happy to support him. The balancing of the Budget is but one. The decreasing of Federal expenditures is another. The lessening of the number of Federal officeholders is another. The creation of a sound currency, the reestablishment of confidence, and so on down the list, almost endless; but these suggestions, like the promises of your platform, of your candidates, you blithely disregard and happily go on your way, scattering the taxpayers' money broadcast over the land—no; not over the land—usually in those localities which Democratic votes can be gathered on election day.

Appropriate money to celebrate? What are we celebrating? What do you want to celebrate? Not long ago you gave the President \$4,000,000,000, and for what purpose? We all know—to relieve distress, to grant unemployment insurance, to establish an old-age pension, to create jobs—all given for the announced reason, and can it be that you had another, that it was necessary, in order to relieve distress, that people might not go hungry, that families might not be disrupted, that homes might not be lost?

Is there any reason why a State should not first put its own house in order? Has Texas a law which prevents the employment of children? Has it a law which limits the hours which a woman may be required to work, the maximum hours under which men may be employed? Has it unemployment insurance? Has it an old-age-pension law down there which will match the Government's share of the money which it just appropriated under the social-security bill?

You are asking for Federal aid to assist you in doing all of these things, and before you do your part you come here with words of praise and with fine phrases and ask the rest of the country to appropriate money taken from the taxpayers to assist you in celebrating, in putting on a show, an exposition. That is all very well and great lessons may be so learned. But in times of adversity—and you have told us endless number of times that these are days of suffering and of sorrow—why celebrate something that happened years and years ago? Do you think for one moment that, if those whose deeds you are commemorating, whose examples you seek to call to mind by this appropriation, were here today that they would join you in asking for an appropriation to celebrate, or would they, as they did in those days when they lived and fought and died for humanity, direct you in no uncertain terms to use that money, your efforts, for the relieving of suffering, for the teaching of the principles of constitutional government?

Were they here, might they not ask you whether you were celebrating the fact that today we have the greatest number of unemployed in the history of our country? Might they not inquire whether you were celebrating the fact that today we have the largest public debt that the Nation ever knew, and call to your attention the fact that we are going more rapidly into debt, day by day, than the country ever went before?

When celebrating, will you call to the mind of the public this rapid increase in the debt which it must some time pay with interest? Will you mention the fact that the greatest number of experiments ever tried—some still persisted in—have proven to be failures; that today the Nation has on its pay roll the largest number of jobholders that ever existed? Are you celebrating the fact that during the last and the present sessions Congress has discarded those principles of government which existed when these men gained the independence of Texas and put her into the Union? Have you forgotten that if they were here today, in order to attain and maintain the freedom for which they fought, they would be forced to repudiate our National Government and those administering it if the policies now advocated by the advisers of the administration be adopted?

Our constructive suggestion today is that you support the President, that you avoid waste, that you economize, that you reduce Federal expenditures, cut out all needless expenditures, quit going into debt, attempt to assist in balancing the Budget, and thus indicate your belief in your party platform, redeem the promises of your Presidential candidature.

Only \$3,000,000. It is not very much as national expenditures go. It may be but a drop in the bucket, but drops like these cause the overflow. You gave San Francisco a little over a million dollars; you gave Philadelphia something over two million; Chicago a little more than a million, for expositions. You of Texas are now asking for three million.

It has been reported that a Member of this House, then a party power, now since risen to a distinguished position at the other end of the Capitol and in the Nation, once said that if the North was to receive a ham, Texas would take a whole hog—perhaps not an elegant expression. Perhaps it should not be here repeated. Nevertheless, a plain, understandable illustration of what you are seeking to do, of what you do, not once in a while but very, very frequently, when you take money from the taxpayers of the North, using it for the benefit of the States which, by their lack of industry or of achievement, have failed to create like wealth subject to taxation.

To my friends on the Republican side, let me repeat: For once let us join together as one solid group and attempt to uphold the hands of the President in his effort, if he makes that effort, to cut out the waste of public money, to get the country back again where its expenditures will be no greater than its income.

Celebrate? Yes; all in due time; but let us postpone all celebration until distress has been alleviated, the condition of the farmer relieved, taxes reduced—it was just a few days ago you voted a continuation of extraordinary taxes.

Let us with national affairs do as we do with matters which affect us individually—celebrate when the victory has been won. Let your celebration in Texas wait until prosperity has returned, and we can all join with you in heartfelt sincerity. Let us deny this application for \$3,000,000 to put on a show, to give an exposition, until the workingman has a job and the unfortunate are assured of at least a decent living. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY].

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Chairman, when this joint resolution came before the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the first time I was deeply impressed by the purpose of this exposition. We in Connecticut are celebrating the three hundredth anniversary this year. In 1635 the first settlement of that small State was made. That small State of 4,000

square miles is almost a mite compared to the 400,000 square miles of Texas.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHANLEY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was wondering how much money the Federal Government gave to Connecticut for its exposition?

Mr. SHANLEY. Connecticut appropriated over \$100,000 from its own State.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am talking about the Federal Government.

Mr. SHANLEY. We asked \$10,000 from the United States, because it is a purely personal, local, and State celebration. It is not an exposition in any sense. We are not inviting foreign nations.

For 300 years we have been either a Commonwealth or a State. This request of the Texas Centennial Commission is a request to celebrate for an area that is probably one of the largest the world has ever seen. It is a request that is comparable to that of the Louisiana Purchase Commission. With the distinguished Members of the minority I had my doubts as to the \$3,000,000 appropriation. I was not convinced until I heard comparable appropriations for other great expositions. I felt that if the State of Texas was willing to spend \$9,000,000 itself, and that we had spent \$6,000,000 for the celebration of the Louisiana Purchase, that \$3,000,000 would be a wise and sanguine investment. I felt that Texas would utilize that \$9,000,000 and the \$3,000,000 to do more good for Texas and incidentally for the country than any other appropriation we have made.

I am not unmindful of the conditions all over the country. I am not unmindful that we cannot stop all efforts of this type. Will we wipe out the Connecticut celebration; will we wipe out the Texas celebration; will we wipe out the San Diego celebration simply because there are other appropriations? I believe that this appropriation of \$3,000,000 will, as gentlemen who have preceded me have said, be scrutinized by the Committee on Appropriations. I believe that that money will be allocated, and that before the Appropriations Committee gets through with it, it may be less than \$3,000,000. I am willing to pass this bill. I am willing to vote for it and willing to present it to the Appropriations Committee, that they, in the larger picture of this country, will be able to justify it if justification is necessary.

I am gratified to say in this three hundredth anniversary of the State of Connecticut that that little Commonwealth has given much to this Nation. We gave the first fundamental orders; the first organic constitution in the history of the world came out of Connecticut. We gave you in the South your cotton gin. We gave you Nathan Hale, and to Texas we gave Moses Austin. It is a pleasure to be able to say that that gentleman came from forbears in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHANLEY. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman give us the date of the commencement of the manufacture of wooden nutmegs in Connecticut?

Mr. SHANLEY. I do not think we have ever given up that practice, we made so much money out of it. We ought to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. EKWALL].

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is no delegation from any State for which I have a higher regard than the delegation from Texas. They are all very fine gentlemen. They are all good American citizens. They are all here trying to do the best they can during this session for their country.

I am not rising in opposition to the amount of this appropriation with any feeling at all of unfriendliness to the great State of Texas nor to the great delegation from Texas, because I have the highest regard for both. In fact, whenever I collaborate with my Texas colleagues I am reminded of the words of that great Irish poet, Thomas Moore:

Long, long may our hearts with true friendship be filled
Like a vase in which roses have once been distilled.
You may break, you may shatter the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will cling round it still.

[Applause.]

That is the way I feel about these gentlemen from Texas. But it seems to me that the amount involved in this bill is entirely too great. I sympathize with their aspirations. I know that they are all good horse traders down there and they always ask for plenty with the idea that, of course, if they have to cut it down to one-third or one-half, at least they have not lost the whole amount.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] remarked that Texas had been carved out by reason of the heroism of the men of Texas. I agree with him. They were a mighty fine group of real men and patriots in those days, as are the Texans today, and they did a fine job of it.

The gentleman says we got the Louisiana Territory by barter and trade. I know he is not complaining because we out-traded France when we got the Louisiana country by spending \$15,000,000, but they are asking for one-fifth of that amount now for an exposition.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EKWALL. I am sorry I cannot yield; I have not the time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. EKWALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman regarding this great territory bought by the blood of Americans from all over the country, greater than the territory acquired through the Louisiana Purchase, if the gentleman does not think we ought to be willing to spend in celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of that victory half as much as we spent celebrating the anniversary of the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory?

Mr. EKWALL. What disturbs me right now is where the watchdogs of the Treasury are. Where is BLANTON? Where is McFARLANE? I have looked in vain for these gentlemen since this resolution was brought up. Time and again I have seen these gentlemen object to meritorious bills for \$100, \$200, \$500, and \$1,000. Then they go back to their constituents, sum up the total amount, and show where they have saved millions of dollars to the taxpayers. I want to read from the RECORD a statement of our genial friend, the sage of Abilene, made when the gentleman from California had up the question of an appropriation for the San Diego fair. Here is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said on January 21:

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] knows that this resolution authorizes an appropriation of \$350,000 for an exposition at San Diego. I am not prejudiced against expositions. I think they are not only entertaining but instructive, but they are becoming very expensive. Can we not have an understanding with the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, and with those who are especially interested that we shall strike out \$350,000 and limit this authorization to—

To what?—

to \$100,000.

[Applause.]

If we could have that understanding, I would be willing to go along; but \$350,000 is a sum entirely too large at this time for us to spend on the exposition in San Diego.

That is the manner in which the gentleman from Texas spoke to us at that time. The question now is why cannot the gentlemen from Texas accept a reasonable amount? Why can they not accept, say, \$1,000,000? The exposition at San Diego is an international exposition. It was allowed \$350,000, but the gentleman from Texas wanted to cut it down to \$100,000, yet that is an international exposition. As the gentleman from California [Mr. COLDEN] has expressed it, they want to spread this entirely over the State of Texas, and goodness only knows how many thousand square miles there are in Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EKWALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman should not charge up against Texas the statement of my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in objecting to \$350,000. He should give Texas credit that I, a Texan, reported out that San Diego resolution for the full \$350,000.

Mr. EKWALL. Yes; that was a mighty fine gesture.

Now, I am going to again wax poetic and read from Don Juan these lines:

'Tis sweet to hear the watchdog's honest bark
Bay deep-mouth'd welcome as we draw near home;
'Tis sweet to know there is an eye will mark
Our coming, and look brighter when we come.

[Applause.]

Let us now be the watchdogs of the Treasury.

We are finally approaching, in this session, the time when we can see the lights of our respective towns and villages off in the immediate distance; we are going home pretty soon. Let us go home with a record of having tried to save the taxpayers some money and yet having done substantial justice to the State of Texas—not only to the State of Texas but to the entire country, for I do not speak disparagingly of the State. We honor the State of Texas; it is a great State, but do not forget that we in the State of Oregon, at Champoege, in 1843, cast the vote which saved the entire Northwest for the United States, rather than voting it into the British Empire. So I do not yield to these gentlemen all the honor of having saved a great area of territory for the United States. But I would remind them that we must think of the interests of the people of this country many of whom are without work, without food and with little of this world's goods to sustain even life itself. It seems to me we ought to consider the taxpayers in this country a little, because we have spent billions of dollars. We should begin to economize.

I am opposed to this bill authorizing an appropriation of \$3,000,000. I place great faith in the judgment of the gentlemen and gentlewomen making up this body as to the right amount to spend for this purpose. We should not simply take the recommendation of the committee or pass the buck to them. I think we ought to reduce this authorization here and now at this time to a reasonable amount, say, \$1,000,000, or at the outside, \$1,500,000. I think this should satisfy these gentlemen, and I believe the country would be satisfied; but for more than this I am not willing to vote.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EKWALL. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I understand the gentleman's position, but will he tell us how he voted on the \$4,800,000,000 bill?

Mr. EKWALL. I will tell the gentleman how I voted, and why I did so. I voted for that bill, although I did not believe in the entire bill. I had to vote that way so that the people in my district and in the country at large could get needed relief, and the only way they could get relief was by our voting for the most tremendous sum of money the taxpayers of this country have ever been asked to pay. That is the reason I voted for that bill. I had to vote for the \$4,000,000,000 appropriation in order to get food and clothing for the people of this country who were out of work and walking the streets. That is why I voted for it and I would vote for it again. However, may I say that I would rather have voted for a disintegrated bill where an independent and separate vote might have been had on the items included in the bill, so that a lot of things might have been eliminated that should not have been in the bill.

The gentleman from Texas talks about sentiment.

I cast a sentimental vote when I voted for the \$4,800,000,000 works relief bill, and I did it through sentiment because I had a feeling for the poor and unfortunate people of this country, who need and must have help.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I was intensely interested in the splendid talk made by the gentleman from Texas recounting the wonderful history of that State and of the

Southwest. I was more interested in the remarks made by the gentlemen who gave the amount of money appropriated by various Congresses for expositions held in commemoration of various events. There was \$6,000,000 appropriated to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase, \$1,500,000 for the Chicago Exposition, and \$1,000,000 for San Francisco, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, Michigan is celebrating her one hundredth anniversary next year. We came down to Washington requesting something for Michigan. We did not ask for \$6,000,000; we did not ask for \$1,000,000; we did not ask for \$200,000. We did not ask for \$1! All we asked was that the Post Office Department issue a stamp commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the adoption of the constitution of the State of Michigan. While this Government was willing to give \$6,000,000 to Louisiana, \$1,000,000 to San Francisco, \$1,500,000 to Chicago, \$350,000 to San Diego, and while you will undoubtedly give \$3,000,000 to Texas, I want to place into the Record the fact that the Republican State of Michigan could not get a postage stamp from the present Democratic administration. [Applause.] Despite repeated requests by letter; despite the fact that several bills were introduced making such requests; despite the further fact that other States were granted a stamp issue commemorating a similar event, the Post Office Department refused to issue a stamp commemorating the one hundredth birthday of the greatest State in the Union—a Republican State—Michigan.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that no more time is desired on the other side, and I therefore ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes

Whereas there is to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936 an exposition and celebrations commemorating the historic period of Texas history and celebrating a century of independence and progress; and

Whereas the State of Texas, the city of Dallas, Tex., and the Texas Centennial Central Exposition, a corporation, are making \$9,000,000 available for such exposition through appropriations and bond issues; and

Whereas such exposition is commemorative of a heroic and successful struggle to establish the independence of a Republic, and this accomplishment resulted from the efforts of patriotic Americans of all sections of our country and led to the acquisition of territory extending far beyond the borders of Texas; and

Whereas the Republic of Texas continued for 9 years after the establishment of its independence and prior to its admission to the Union as a State, and foreign Governments sent their diplomatic representatives to the Republic of Texas; and

Whereas such exposition and celebrations are worthy and deserving of the support and encouragement of the United States; and the United States has aided and encouraged such expositions and celebrations in the past: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested, by proclamation or in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite all foreign countries and nations to such proposed exposition with a request that they participate therein.

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Clerk reading the bill, Senate Joint Resolution 131, or the amended bill from the Senate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reading from the engrossed copy of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. BURNHAM. Do we have copies of that bill here?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the gentleman that it is identical except for the amendments set out in italics.

Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to consider the various committee amendments to the bill and not read the entire bill?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in the first place what are the committee amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the gentleman a copy of the House bill as amended?

Mr. TABER. I have a copy of the Senate bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House bill is the same as the Senate bill, except in italics throughout the House bill there are various committee amendments.

Mr. TABER. Where does the first one appear?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In section 2, line 10, the words "and hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission.'" I am just trying to expedite things.

Mr. TABER. I have an amendment which I desire to offer at the appropriate place.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there are no amendments to be offered to this bill until section 7 is reached; I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD down to and including section 6.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The portion of the bill referred to is as follows:

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Commission, to be known as "The United States Texas Centennial Commission" and to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce; which Commission shall serve without additional compensation and shall represent the United States in connection with the holding of an exposition and celebration during the observance of the Texas Centennial in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a United States Commissioner General for the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and to receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum and one or more assistant commissioners for said Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be appointed by the Commissioner General with the approval of the Commission herein designated and to receive compensation not to exceed \$7,500 per annum, respectively. The expenses of the Commissioner General and such staff as he may require shall be paid out of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall prescribe the duties of the United States Commissioner General and shall delegate such powers and functions to him as it shall deem advisable, in order that there may be exhibited at the Texas Centennial Exposition by the Government of the United States, its executive departments, independent offices and establishments such articles and materials and documents and papers as may relate to this period of our history and such as illustrate the function and administrative faculty of the Government in the advancement of industry, science, invention, agriculture, the arts, and peace, and demonstrating the nature of our institutions, particularly as regards their adaptation to the needs of the people.

SEC. 5. The Commissioner General is authorized to appoint such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary, and to fix their salaries in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase such materials, contract for such labor and other services as are necessary, and exercise such powers as are delegated to him by the Commission as hereinbefore provided, and in order to facilitate the functioning of his office may subdelegate such powers (authorized or delegated) to the Assistant Commissioner or others in the employ of or detailed to the Commission as may be deemed advisable by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The heads of the various executive departments and independent offices and establishments of the Government are authorized to cooperate with said Commissioner General in the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits, and to lend to the Texas Centennial Commission and the Texas Centennial Central Exposition, with the knowledge and consent of said Commissioner General, such articles, specimens, and exhibits which said Commissioner General shall deem to be in the interest of the United States and in keeping with the purposes of such exposition and celebrations to place with the science or other exhibits to be shown under the auspices of such Texas Centennial Commission or the Texas Centennial Central Exposition or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations, to contract for such labor or other services as shall be deemed necessary, and to designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist said Commissioner General. At the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, said Commissioner General shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken, and any expenses incident to the restoration, modification, and revision of such property to a condition which will permit its use at subsequent expositions and fairs, and for the continued employment of personnel necessary to close out the fiscal and other records and prepare the required reports of the participating organizations, may be paid from the appropriation authorized herein; and if the return of such property is not feasible, he may, with the consent of the department or branch from which it was taken, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 10, after the word "Commission", insert "and hereinafter referred to as the Commission."

Page 2, line 11, after the word "the" where it occurs the first time, insert "Vice President, the."

Page 3, line 8, after the word "and", strike out "one or more" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed three."

Page 3, line 13, after the word "the", insert "salary and."

Page 3, line 16, after the word "resolution", insert "for a period of time covering the duration of the exposition and not to exceed a 6 months' period following the closing thereof."

Page 4, line 23, after the word "lend", strike out "to the Texas Centennial Commission" and insert "to the Commission and to the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations."

Page 5, line 8, after the word "Commission", insert "or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations."

Page 5, line 19, after the word "subsequent", strike out the words "expositions and" and insert the word "expositions", and after the word "fairs", insert "and other celebrations."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The sum of \$3,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and shall remain available until expended. Subject to the provisions of this joint resolution and any subsequent act appropriating the money authorized herein, the Commission is authorized to make any expenditures or allotments deemed necessary by it to fulfill properly the purposes of this joint resolution and to allocate such sums to the Texas Centennial Commission and the Texas Centennial Central Exposition for expenditure by such bodies in any part of the State of Texas as the Commission deems necessary and proper in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. And, subject to the provisions of this joint resolution and any subsequent act appropriating the money authorized herein, the Commission is authorized to erect such building or buildings, or other structures, and to provide for the landscaping of the site or sites thereof; to rent such space as the Commission may deem adequate to carry out effectively the provisions of this joint resolution; and to provide for the decoration of such buildings or structures, and for the proper maintenance of such buildings or structures, site and grounds during the period of the exposition. The Commission may contract with the Texas Centennial Commission and/or the Texas Centennial Central Exposition for the designing and erection of such building or buildings, structure or structures, and for the rental of such space as shall be deemed necessary and proper. The appropriation authorized under this joint resolution shall be available for the operation of the building or buildings, structure or structures, including light, heat, water, gas, janitor, and other required services; for the selection, purchase, preparation, assembling, transportation, installation, arrangement, safe-keeping, exhibition, demonstration, and return of such articles and materials as the Commission may decide shall be included in such Government exhibit and in the exhibits of the Texas Centennial Commission or the Texas Centennial Central Exposition; for the compensation of said Commissioner General, Assistant Commissioners, and other officers and employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Government employed by or detailed for duty with the Commission, and for actual traveling expenses, including travel by air, and for per diem in lieu of actual subsistence at not to exceed \$6 per day: *Provided*, That no such Government official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed, plus such reasonable allowance for travel, including travel by air, and subsistence expenses as may be deemed proper by the Commissioner General; for telephone service, purchase or rental of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, duplicating, and computing machines, their accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, uniforms, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers and all other appropriate publications, and ice and drinking water for office purposes: *Provided*, That payment for telephone service, rents, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and other similar purposes, may be made in advance; for the purchase and hire of passenger-carrying automobiles, their maintenance, repair, and operation, for the official use of said Commissioner General and Assistant Commissioners in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as required; for printing and binding; for entertainment of distinguished visitors; and for all other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Commission to fulfill properly the purposes of this joint resolution. All purchases, expenditures, and disbursements of any moneys made available by authority of this joint resolution shall be made under the direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission, as hereinbefore stipulated, may delegate these powers and functions to said Commissioner General, and said Commissioner General, with the consent of the Commission, may subdelegate them: *Provided further*, That the Commission or its delegated representative may allot funds authorized to be appropriated herein to any executive department, independent office, or establishment of the Government with the consent of the heads thereof, for direct expenditure by such executive department, independent office, or establishment, for the purpose of defraying any expendi-

ture which may be incurred by such executive department, independent office, or establishment in executing the duties and functions delegated by the Commission. All accounts and vouchers covering expenditures shall be approved by said Commissioner General or by such assistants as he may designate except for such allotments as may be made to the various executive departments, independent offices, and establishments for direct expenditure; but these provisions shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit, or permit any obligations to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized herein: *Provided*, That in the construction of buildings and exhibits requiring skilled and unskilled labor, the prevailing rate of wages, as provided in the act of March 3, 1931, shall be paid.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, line 6, after the word "expended", insert "for the purposes of this joint resolution and any unexpended balances shall be covered back into the Treasury of the United States."

Page 6, line 14, after the word "Commission", insert the words "or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations."

Page 7, line 4, after the word "Commission", strike out the words "and/or" and insert the words "or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations or."

Page 7, line 18, after the word "Commission", insert "or the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations."

Page 9, line 3, after the word "Commission", insert the words "without release of responsibility."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 5, line 22, after the word "of", strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, personally I have the greatest admiration for the State of Texas and for its Representatives here. Many of them are my close friends, and I admire them very much.

I am going to picture the embarrassing situation that the Representative from Texas, the great Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will be in when it is put up to him to keep down the amount authorized in this bill. Surely you would not expect a man with a record such as he has to do anything else. Why should you embarrass him by not meeting the responsibility that is yours here and now?

It has been customary to appropriate for expositions where they are being held throughout the country a reasonable amount for Government exhibits, and to that principle I subscribe.

But since the depression begun, and practically since expositions began to be held more generally through the country, it has been customary for this Congress to keep the expense of those exhibitions down.

It is true that over 30 years ago there was an appropriation of over \$5,000,000 for the Louisiana Exposition, but that, as I say, was 30 years ago. Now, in recent years the only one I can find is the exhibition at Chicago, where they appropriated \$1,192,000 for 2 years' exhibition. This year we appropriated \$350,000 for an exposition at San Diego, and there for that international exposition people have raised at their own expense \$12,000,000—as much, practically, as you raised for this in Texas.

Why cannot you accept the amendment that I have offered? I think a million and a half dollars is a fair amount.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. How much was appropriated for the exposition at Philadelphia?

Mr. TABER. Two million dollars.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Michigan said they could not get an appropriation. I favored that and I favor this.

Mr. TABER. I think a million and half dollars is a fair and reasonable amount for this purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Chicago had two expositions. Does the gentleman know how much was appropriated for the first exposition at Chicago?

Mr. TABER. I have not those figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There was an exposition at Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Mr. TABER. The San Francisco Exposition several years ago had an appropriation of \$1,192,000.

Mr. BURNHAM. For the exposition at San Diego 20 years ago the Government did not contribute.

Mr. TABER. I understand that is true, but I was talking about San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out "\$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: Amend the amendment by striking out "\$1,500,000" in the Taber amendment and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this matter, no estimates have been made, no arrangements have been perfected to spend the \$3,000,000. They simply come in here with a resolution, hit and miss, asking Congress for \$3,000,000.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Not now. If that is the case, it seems to me that we can well economize in our recognition to the extent of allowing only \$1,000,000 for this celebration. You do not know today where you are going to celebrate in Texas, you have not determined upon what you are going to do in the various cities, you have no central point where your exposition is to be held, you are simply asking Congress for \$3,000,000 to be used in such celebration as you may determine upon at a later date.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman recognizes the fact that this is only an authorization.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the point. It is only an authorization.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. All these things will have to be shown before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not believe that any committee of the House should authorize the expenditure of \$3,000,000 until at least it has some evidence before it as to when and where and how specifically this money is to be expended. I may be a crank on these things, but when the Chicago resolution was up, a similar resolution, I moved at that time to strike from the resolution \$250,000. That amendment was agreed to by an almost unanimous vote, because they did not show that they needed that amount of money. In other words, they were permitted to cut their cloth according to the amount of cloth they had to cut, and that is what Texas should do. You are asking for \$3,000,000. You hardly expect to get \$3,000,000, but you are going to cut your celebration to fit the amount of money that you can get from Congress.

Much has been said here today about economy in these times. I am not going to take any more time. I respect Texas, I love Texas, I would do anything in the world for my good friend, FRITZ LANHAM, and the other Members, and they know it, but when they are wrong I do not hesitate to say I think so. If this thing were outlined, if we knew where and when and how this money is to be spent, I would vote for it, but under the conditions I cannot. I believe \$1,000,000 is sufficient to permit these people to carry on a dignified and proper and a real celebration.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Let us assume that they attend this great celebration in Texas to the extent of the admissions recorded at Chicago, where 42,000,000 admissions were recorded. Assuming that you pay on an average of \$1 admission, then the Federal Government would receive 10 percent of those gate receipts in taxes, so that the Federal Government would receive \$4,000,000 for its contribution of \$3,000,000. [Applause.]

Mr. COLDEN. Does the gentleman recall at any time that Los Angeles ever received an appropriation from the Federal Government for an exposition of any kind?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I regret that it has never received any; but we would if we had such an exposition.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes.

Mr. TRUAX. Does the gentleman favor and condone the amusement taxes and other nuisance taxes? Does the gentleman think we ought to continue to levy these nuisance taxes so that the Federal Government might be reimbursed for these appropriations?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. We just continued those nuisance taxes.

Mr. TRUAX. Not by my vote. With 22,000,000 people starving except for Government doles, with a quarter of a million farmers about to be foreclosed because of the Supreme Court decision, with 4,000,000 World War veterans denied their bonus, and with a national debt of more than \$30,000,000,000, it is time that Federal authorizations and appropriations for unnecessary and extraneous projects should be stopped. I expect to vote "no" on the bill. If a motion to recommit is offered which provides for reducing the authorization from \$3,000,000 to \$1,500,000, I shall vote "present" on that motion, since I will not vote for either amount.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. For the next 2 years.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to take your time at this late hour in the afternoon. I very much hope that I may have your attention because this is a rather important matter. In the first place, I say to my friend from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], that the plan has been determined upon in Texas, and the place where the chief celebration is to be held has been determined. It happens to be the city which I have the honor to represent. We do not have big cities in Texas. It is a pretty heavy strain upon any community to act as host for a great celebration such as this will be. The city of Dallas, where the chief part of the exposition is to be held, is a city of 300,000 people. That city is putting up in cash around \$6,000,000 and giving the use of its fair grounds.

I was not surprised at what was said by one man who rose here, but there were many Members who got up here at whom I was surprised. Now, this is not a Democratic celebration. It is not a Texas celebration. Nothing like this, Mr. Chairman, has occurred in the history of this Republic from the time it began. I do not want to repeat what has been said, but we purchased Louisiana with money. There were no great centers of activity there that thrilled and charmed the souls of men. This is not a celebration of Texas. These were not Texas men who did this thing which we are to celebrate. Red-blooded men came from every section of this great Nation.

I should like to have my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] read the farewell address of Anson Jones, the last President of Texas, a great man whom Massachusetts contributed to that great republic. The words of that address ring through the pages of human history. Tell me that the people of Massachusetts are not willing to make a reasonable contribution to commemorate and celebrate the independence of that government and of that people, whose highest office was surrendered by a son of Massachusetts in order that Texas might become, by its own free will, one of the States of this Union.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. In just a moment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman asked me a question and I should like to answer it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Very well.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think if we give you a million and a half that Massachusetts and every other State in the Union will be liberally contributing.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I know you do. Anson Jones would not have thought it. He was willing to give his life for Texas. [Applause.] The gentleman will be ashamed of

his speech some day. When he comes down to Texas and I entertain him, as I hope I may have the privilege to do, and he realizes what we are celebrating, he will be ashamed of the speech he made. When he goes through that great State and sees the footprints of Anson Jones, the gentleman will be ashamed of his speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Now, I can understand this situation. I can understand the temper of some Members of the House, but my little city has put up \$6,000,000 to help commemorate the deeds of Anson Jones and the rest of these noble men who gave freedom to Texas and gave Texas to this Republic. My city of Dallas, that community of 300,000 people, is putting up its money to do honor to your sons, more than it can afford. I could call the roll of the States and they would all answer on this roll of fame and glory. They were not men who put up the money to buy a territory as Louisiana was bought. I have nothing to say about that, but we gave \$6,000,000, I believe, to celebrate the coming in of that Territory, acquired by purchase. Texas was not got that way. Men from Louisiana helped. Men gave their blood for Texas, sacrificed their lives. They died at San Jacinto, Goliad, and the Alamo. They did not sell Texas to the Union. They bought Texas with their lives and gave it to the Union. It is not as though we located one place or could locate one where we are to celebrate. Do you mean to tell me that we are not to go to Goliad? Take the Nation to Goliad and let them see how red-blooded men were willing to serve and die for their country! Is that not worth a few dollars to this Nation now, when men are soft? Take them to the Alamo! It is worth it to this Nation to take the people of this country to that holy shrine and let them see how men died for a great principle in this hour when people are soft! [Applause.] Take them to San Jacinto, where DICK KLEBERG's granddaddy fought! Take them where the sons of your own States did these deeds of service, or might, and of sacrifice!

When you come to look at this and study it as a practical proposition, I am candid when I say I do not know how much it will take for the Nation to make a contribution and a fair exhibition. I do not know that. You do not know it, but we do know we have to begin next year. We have two checks on that fund. We have the check of the Commission, and we have the check of the Appropriations Committee. I want to tell you "old Buck" and the rest of the members of that committee have got the nerve to do what is right. [Applause.] But we do not want any niggardly sum.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why pass the buck to "Buck"? [Laughter.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We are not passing the buck to "Buck." We are settling this matter in a tentative way at least.

I heard some of these gentlemen from California sort of mouthing about this. They should be ashamed of themselves. If it had not been for San Jacinto, if it had not been for the Alamo, if it had not been for the sacrifices of your sons in Texas, the flag of Mexico might be floating over that country now. We liberated California—not "we", but the men who were contributed by every State of this Nation did that job.

We want you to come down to Texas—not to see what Texans did but to see what the sons of your States did and give our people an opportunity to show their appreciation for your contribution. This is not ours. I am not asking for anything for Texas. This is the Nation's job, and we want \$3,000,000, and we do not want any chinchy thing done about this. We want a celebration of a nation that

shows itself fit to be the sons of the people who made Texas free. [Applause.] We do not want any men of this generation splitting 15 or 20 cents when it comes to commemorating the deeds of heroism of those people—the history of which makes our country great. This Nation needs to look upon the deeds of these men who held it high duty to serve.

Now, let us see if this is not a fair deal which is proposed.

Do you mean to tell me you are not willing to commemorate and celebrate this achievement? No; you will not say that. There is not a man or woman here who is fit to be here who will say that. I make that statement deliberately. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I take that back, I do not like that statement, I take it back. My community of 300,000 people is putting up \$6,000,000 to commemorate this achievement of what your fathers did down there. We are putting up over \$6,000,000, our 300,000 people are taxing themselves \$6,000,000 to commemorate the deeds of the men who bought this territory with their lives and gave it to you.

The things and places that are holy about Texas are scattered all over the State. We do not know whether \$3,000,000 will be enough or not, but we in my city put up \$6,000,000 and the State put up \$3,000,000. Is it too much to ask that you at least provide a maximum amount of \$3,000,000 with a check on it in the first instance of the commission and in the last instance of the appropriating committee? [Applause.] That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 39, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, which I have already sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: Page 6, line 5, after the word "Commission", insert "the board of directors of the Texas Memorial Museum."

And on page 6, line 13, after the word "thereof", insert "to grant toward the Texas Memorial Museum such sum as may be specifically provided for that purpose by the act making the appropriation authorized by this joint resolution."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand these amendments are acceptable to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the amendments are acceptable to the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this joint resolution may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

All accounts and vouchers covering expenditures shall be approved by said Commissioner General or by such assistants as he may designate, except for such allotments as may be made to the various executive departments, independent offices, and establishments for direct expenditure; but these provisions shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit, or permit any obligations to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized herein: *Provided*, That in the construction of buildings and—

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today an appropriation of money by the Congress of the United States for celebrations of the Texas centennial. No amount of money which Congress might appropriate for these celebrations could be too much, for Congress should see to it

that the great history of Texas shall be emphasized as a never-failing source of inspiration for all Americans and for all time.

I shall not burden you with a long talk on the history of Texas, but I want you to realize the importance of that history in relation to the general history of the whole United States of America.

Because our Nation originated in the eastern seaboard and in the Thirteen Colonies, those Thirteen Colonies have been considered as the most important foundations of our history, and I believe that is correct. However, I submit that Texas is next in importance. While the Thirteen Colonies were being formed, the might of Spain covered all of South America and Mexico and Texas, and from Texas east to Florida, and from Texas west to California. Texas became a republic in 1836, after a bloody revolution.

Preceding the formation of the Republic of Texas, we see the might of Spain, its soldiers and priests, its martyrs and statesmen. We are prone to belittle people of other nationalities; we are prone to brag about our own greatness, and yet, while being conscious of our own greatness, we must recognize greatness in others. We should not forget the greatness of Spain and of Mexico, for those two nations are really the background of Texas.

Texas has been under six flags; let us take them in order. First, Texas was under the flag of Spain; for a brief period it was under that of France; back again it came to the flag of Spain; and then in 1821, after a revolution, came the flag of Mexico. Mexico's break with Spain is one of the most dramatic episodes in world history. The great priests and martyrs—Hidalgo and Morelos—form its beginning. The Generals Nicolas Bravo, Guadalupe Victoria, and others not quite so glorious, brought it to a conclusion. Then, over in Texas, the Anglo-Saxon population, mostly Americans, led by Stephen F. Austin, moved into the great State of Texas. Later they revolted against the Government of Mexico and set up an independent republic. This was one of the strangest and most colorful of revolutions, as I shall tell you later. Then under Gen. Sam Houston, as President, who was formerly a Member of the United States Congress, and Governor of Tennessee, Texas became a part of the United States of America. Later it seceded from the United States of America and became a part of the Confederate States; and then back again it came to the Stars and Stripes. This accounts for the six flags of Texas—no other portion of the United States has had this history.

Yes, Texas has had a colorful history—romantically colorful—colored by the blood of its martyrs, and by the brave men and women who created civilization and culture in an uncharted and dangerous wilderness.

Consider the various factors in the Texas revolution. The State had altogether not over 35,000 men, women, and children. Texas was then almost twice its present size and over this vast territory armies were assembled to revolt against a nation with a population of some 7,000,000, a disparity of 200 to 1; it is really true that there is no parallel to this in world history. And nothing in all the history of heroism and sacrifice for a real cause can exceed the Battle of the Alamo. On the 23d of February 1836, the first alarm was given of the approach of the Mexicans on the Alamo. William Barrett Travis and James Bowie were there, as were 180 other heroes. For 10 days or more these men battled a force of 2,500 Mexicans under the dictator, Santa Anna. Enthusiastic historians say 4,000 Mexicans, the Mexicans say 1,500, calmer historians estimate the 2,500 as approximately correct. But we do know that the Texans were faced by veteran soldiers, outnumbered 10 or 20 to 1, with superior equipment—in fact, the Texans had practically none, finding all but two of their cannon spiked and useless.

One of those in the Alamo was Davy Crockett, who had been a Member of the Congress of the United States from Tennessee, and who was a very famous man in his own right, long before he came to Texas. He was the originator of the famous saying, "Be sure you are right, then go ahead."

These brave men had little chance. They sent requests for help, which were never received, or if received, they were ignored, except for a small band of men from Gonzales under Bonham. To show the psychology of the time, I offer for the RECORD a letter sent by Lt. Col. William Barrett Travis, which is as follows:

COMMANDANCY OF THE ALAMO,
Bexar, February 24, 1836.

Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continued bombardment for 24 hours, and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise the garrison is to be put to the sword if the place is taken. I have answered the summons with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the wall. I shall never surrender or retreat. Then I call on you in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and of everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy are receiving reinforcements daily, and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. Though this call may be neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible, and die like a soldier who forgets not what is due to his own honor and that of his country. Victory or death.

W. BARRETT TRAVIS,
Lieutenant Colonel Commanding.

P. S.—The Lord is on our side. When the enemy appeared in sight we had not 3 bushels of corn. We have since found in deserted houses 80 or 90 bushels and got into the walls 20 or 30 head of beeves.—T.

The battle concluded Sunday morning, on March 6, 1836. All of those who were in the Alamo were killed, with the exception of Mrs. Dickinson, her little child, a Negro slave belonging to Travis, and a few Mexican women.

The Battle of the Alamo is well covered in many books, but the vast and wide implications of the history of the Alamo should be known by the people of the United States. What did it do? First, it showed that human beings can make sacrifices—and that there is such a thing as patriotism. This ought to be a lesson today. I do not mean that we should go out and offer ourselves to be shot or killed for the sake of gaining some point, although I believe that there are many hundreds of thousands of Americans that would be willing to do it, if they thought they would accomplish anything by it. By saying that there is such a thing as "patriotism", I mean that there is such a thing as patriotism now. The example of the Alamo should not be lost to us. If a man will willingly lose his life for the liberty of his people and for posterity, certainly now a man should be willing to lose his political life in standing up for the things that are right and just. The thing that faced the Texans was political tyranny; what we face now is a tyranny of the special interests, against the Government of the United States; and against these special interests, or the tyranny of those special interests, all of us must stand today.

The second thing that the Battle of the Alamo did was to start the momentous events which brought the great State of Texas as a part of the Union of the United States, and I call to your attention that Texas then had within its boundaries a part of Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and New Mexico. Besides that, of course, the whole West became a part of the United States. As a result of the Battle of the Alamo there came to the United States its greatest mineral and oil and agricultural wealth; likewise millions upon millions of acres of great forests, also of grazing land, which with its cattle, has gone far toward making up one of the most powerful nations on the face of the earth.

During the time that Texas was a republic—from 1836 to 1845—she was twice invaded by Mexican armies. Texas, herself, attacked portions of Mexico during her 9 years of existence. In fact, the Republic of Texas lived for 9 years battling internal enemies among the Indians and battling Mexico, and it was a wonder that she preserved herself, having no well-founded financial system, and having nothing whatever to protect her except the resolute desire of the free-born Texans to live like human beings. That spirit that made them revolt against the dictator of Mexico, to preserve themselves, and to finally merge with the United States of America, was a brave spirit and the same spirit that we must have if we are to attack the problems of this

depression and finally gain self-respecting lives as free-born American citizens.

It is not possible at this time to realize the daring of these Texans. Texas built a navy and decided to do some conquering on her own behalf—but briefly, the sad story of the Texas navy is this: The "authorities" managed, in the early part of 1836 to pick up a small navy of three vessels, namely, the *Invincible*, Capt. L. Brown; the *Brutus*, Captain Hurd; and the *Independence*, Captain Hawkins. The *Invincible* carried 8 port guns and 1 pivot 9-pounder; the *Brutus* of like force; the *Independence* of 8 guns. Later, the *Liberty*, with 3 guns, was added to the fleet. These boats captured a number of Mexican vessels. The *Independence* was captured by the Mexicans; the *Invincible* struck on breakers near Galveston Harbor and went to pieces. The *Brutus* ran aground during a battle with the Mexicans.

In 1838–39 the Texas navy was augmented by purchase of vessels: The *San Jacinto*, the *San Antonio*, the *San Bernard* and the *Colorado*. In 1839 the steamship-of-war, *Zavala*, purchased by Gen. James Hamilton, was added; also the *Charleston*. Due to the deplorable condition of the navy, the President of the Republic directed in 1842 that the vessels be placed in ordinary or be sold. They were placed in ordinary, and so remained until the annexation of the Republic to the United States.

There also occurred the Santa Fe Expedition, an ambitious enterprise of the Texans, but rather more foolhardy than otherwise. This expedition left Brushy Creek, about 15 miles above Austin, on June 21, 1841, with a military escort, commissioners from the Republic of Texas, and about 50 merchants and traders. For about 6 weeks the journey was pleasant enough, through a wild country which afforded plenty of game for food, and an abundance of water and grass for the horses and cattle. Then they entered a mountainous, arid region, and soon the last of the cattle were slaughtered and provisions ran short. To obtain food for more than 300 men was a difficult task. After wandering for some time, and being attacked by Indians on numerous occasions, some of the expeditions turned back. After experiencing much hardship, about 90 of the men reached a sheep ranch on the Rio Gallinas in New Mexico, where they were provided with food. Others of the party proceeded to San Miguel. Governor Armijo, of New Mexico, hearing of the approach of the Texans, set about to immediately alarm the people that the Texans were coming to conquer the country. When the expedition resumed its journey it was met by a force of Mexican soldiers, and captured. Governor Armijo and a force of 600 met the Texans on the way to Santa Fe, and they were taken to Santa Fe as prisoners. On October 17, 1841, the unhappy Texans were started on the long journey to Mexico City on foot. From the moment of their surrender the prisoners were treated with great cruelty by Armijo's soldiers, and the march from San Miguel to the border of New Mexico at El Paso was one of almost constant torture. Many of the men, who found it difficult to keep going, were shot down in their tracks and their bodies left by the wayside. At the border they were turned over to troops of the national government and marched to Mexico City.

Some of the members of the party who claimed citizenship of other countries appealed to their respective diplomatic representatives for aid, and through the effort of the foreign ministers at the Mexican capital these were released in the course of a few months. The Mexican Government reluctantly released those who could claim the protection of the United States or of European Governments, but the rest were kept confined in military prisons for 4 months. Waddy Thompson, of South Carolina, was sent to Mexico by the United States Government to procure the release of the citizens of this country. On June 16, 1842, most of the Texans were released by order of Santa Anna. Jose Antonio Navarro, one of the Texan commissioners, was kept in prison at the capital until December 1844. He was moved to Vera Cruz, from which place he escaped and returned to Texas in 1845.

And Texas was invaded by Mexico in 1842; and San Antonio was captured on the 11th day of September in that year by a Mexican Army under Gen. Adrian Woll, a Frenchman in Mexican service. He took 53 prisoners, who were thereafter known as the "Bexar prisoners", for San Antonio was then, and is now, a part of Bexar, now Bexar County, and the Twentieth Congressional District.

The Texans captured were marched barefooted through cold and heat, over cactus deserts, high mountains, through great forests and plains, through cities and towns to the Castle of Perote, a great prison and fortress between the cities of Jalapa and Puebla in Mexico, a distance of 1,200 miles, where they were held for 10 months. I have visited this huge prison—a cold, stern place of beautiful Spanish architecture, and there I saw the cell block of my grandfather, Samuel A. Maverick, one of the "Bexar prisoners."

The suffering of the Bexar prisoners cannot even be understood at this late date. The men were famished, starved, kept without news while their wives shifted for themselves in the vast, wild, Indian-infested prairies of Texas; and yet it stands as a fact, they never lost hope—continued to make the sacrifice through all these hardships and never lost their sense of humor. There were many tragic instances of death and suffering; they were serious men, but, as I said, they never lost their sense of humor. One of the instances was their celebration, in chains at Perote, of Texas' independence.

Familiar with the refinements of civilization they asked the Mexican authorities for good whisky and eggnog—but got horrible tequila—distilled from cactus—and goat milk; with this concoction they proceeded to celebrate, rattling their chains of slavery, taunting their Mexican captors and singing rowdy songs of the day. Some day I may be criticized for this, but the diaries of the prisoners attest to the truth of it. I trust my relative behaved with the dignity of a Congressman on that occasion.

Yes, Texas, and San Antonio will always really be a symbol of something worth while.

"Patriotism", according to Dr. Samuel Johnson, is sometimes "the last resort of the scoundrel"—and it is likewise the most precious thing to a decent human being. But I think it fair to say that there is a changing concept of patriotism. Wars are, or should be, over. Pioneering, as we once understood it, is over. But the war to make the world a decent place to live in, the pioneering of science, government, progress, has just begun. Those who are willing to be the new soldiers and pioneers will have a harder enemy to meet—the special interests, the exploiters, the gods of Greed and Hate—and they will use persecution, ridicule, hate. The enemies of civilization will use crooked finance, combines, the ridicule and falsity of a controlled press—and all of this will take far more courage than facing bullets. A bullet gives us peace, but the modern form of warfare lets us live in unhappiness, so I repeat we need more courage now than before.

Forgive me, however, for my philosophizing. Let me get back to the Alamo, to San Antonio, and to Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Federal Government should recognize the Alamo, of San Antonio, Tex., as a monument of patriotism for future ages. I say this not because it is within my district, nor because I was born within a block of the Alamo, but because I believe the Alamo to be fully as important as the Battles of Lexington and Concord, and because I believe it obvious that it should be recognized as a national monument by all the people of the United States.

Of course, the Alamo is owned by the State of Texas, and Texans are very proud and jealous of it; they would probably object to passing title to the Federal Government. However, there is no reason why the Federal Government should not have, surrounding the Alamo, certain lands and properties in order to give it more fitting recognition. You know, we people down South come up East to see the historical points here, and we would like very much for the eastern people to come down South and see what we have there. Not only should they acquaint themselves with the great history of our Republic in Texas and how we came into the Union, but they should also see the civilization brought by the

Franciscan Friars, the Spanish officials, and others who colonized and Christianized that area. Many Spanish colonial missions were established in Texas, and the most beautiful mission of all in the entire continent of North America is in San Antonio, Tex.

It is Mission San Jose, established near San Antonio in the year 1718. The rock carving there is not surpassed anywhere else in the world. It is in a good state of preservation and it is worth going all the way to San Antonio to see. There are other missions in San Antonio besides the Alamo and San Jose—the Missions Concepcion, San Juan de Capistrano, San Fernando, and San Francisco de las Espada.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a brief list of the missions of Texas:

THE TEXAS MISSIONS

1. San Francisco de los Tejas,¹ 1690, near Crockett, Tex.
2. Santísimo Nombre de Maria,¹ 1690, southwestern part of Cherokee County.
3. San Francisco de los Neches,¹ 1716, near Alto, Tex.
4. Purísima Concepcion,¹ 1716, Angelina River.
5. San Jose de los Nazones,¹ 1716, about 30 miles from Concepcion.
6. Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe,¹ 1716, at Nacogdoches, Tex.
7. Nuestra Senora de los Dolores,¹ 1717, at San Augustine, Tex.
8. San Miguel,¹ 1717, at Robeline, La.
9. San Antonio de Valero,² the Alamo, San Antonio, 1718.
10. San Jose de Aguayo,² 1720, Bexar County, near San Antonio.
11. San Xavier de Naxera,¹ 1722, Bexar County, near San Antonio, between San Jose and the Alamo; exact site unknown.
12. Espiritu Santo,² 1722, near Victoria, then to San Antonio River.
13. Purísima Concepcion de Acuna,² 1731, San Antonio, Bexar County.
14. San Francisco de la Espada,² 1731, Bexar County, near San Antonio.
15. San Juan Capistrano,² 1731, Bexar County, near San Antonio.
16. San Francisco Xavier,¹ 1746, San Gabriel River.
17. San Ildefonso,¹ 1749, on the San Gabriel River.
18. Candelaria,¹ 1749, on the San Gabriel River.
19. Nuestra Senora del Rosario,¹ 1754, near Goliad, Tex.
20. San Marcos,¹ 1755, on the San Marcos River.
21. Nuestra Senora de la Luz,¹ 1756, Atascosito, Chambers County.
22. Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe,¹ 1757, on Guadalupe near New Braunfels.
23. Santa Cruz or San Saba,¹ 1757, near Menardville on the San Saba.
24. San Lorenzo,¹ 1762, 70 miles southeast of San Saba.
25. Nuestra Senora del Refugio,¹ 1793, at Refugio, Tex.

In connection with the Texas centennial in 1936—every American should take a trip through the South. If you can, go by the Tennessee Valley Authority and see the greatest achievements of present American history—go by New Orleans, where you will also see some Spanish colonial civilization, besides French civilization—drive through Texas, and spend 2 or 3 days in San Antonio, which is one of the two or three most beautiful cities in America. If you have time, drive down into Mexico, where you will see many more beautiful cities, come back by San Antonio, drive out through the west through New Mexico, where you will see some of the most beautiful mountain scenery in the world, and also a great deal of some Spanish civilization, and then go through Arizona into southern California. You can then realize the might and greatness of the State of Texas and also realize the might and greatness of much of our southern part of the United States, of Texas, and of the West.

And then, when we realize the greatness of our continent and of our national history, let us get busy considering how we are going to set this country back on its feet, kill this awful depression, and to conserve, through national action, our natural resources, put people to work, and make it so one can live in decency and fair comfort, a good standard of living, with education, sanitation, and proper housing.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a compendium of Texas history from earliest times until it became a part of the United States. This compendium has been prepared for me by the Honorable J. Marvin Hunter, of Bandera, Tex., one of the foremost authorities on southwestern history in America. He is publisher of the Frontier Times. He began to print the Frontier Times 12

¹ No traces of the buildings left.

² In fair state of preservation.

years ago, and he has collected together thousands of stories about the history of Texas and the great Southwest. The service that he has rendered the country is very great, and it should be recognized.

I find since coming to Congress that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is really read very widely by all classes of our citizens, but particularly students, teachers, and those doing research work. I have largely made this effort today for the permanent record of history, and now offer for printing the compendium of my distinguished fellow Texan, Hon. J. Marvin Hunter:

A COMPENDIUM OF TEXAS HISTORY COMPOSED BY HON. J. MARVIN HUNTER

The first white man who saw Texas was probably Alvarez de Pineda, who, in 1518, 20 years after Columbus, made a map which delineated Matagorda Bay, which he named La Bahia del Espiritu Santo.

In 1527 the Spanish King commissioned Panfilo de Narvaez to command a fleet which explored the country north of Tampico and east of Florida. Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca accompanied this expedition. The fleet was lost in the Gulf of Mexico, and Cabeza de Vaca, with some of the crew, was cast upon the coast. After 8 years' wandering they reached a Spanish settlement in Mexico, and in due time reached Spain.

In 1538 Hernando de Soto reached Florida, and after 3 years in the country which is now the Gulf States, he reached and crossed the Mississippi River. De Soto died near the mouth of the Red River. His survivors traveled westward 150 leagues, which, from their description, has been identified as the eastern Cross Timbers of Texas.

In 1540 Francisco Vasquez Coronado set forth from Mexico with 250 horsemen and 70 Spanish infantry, accompanied by a number of priests, and passed through the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, through New Mexico, and entered Texas, their route being across a portion of the Staked Plains.

In 1682 a company of Spaniards under Espejo visited the upper Rio Grande and established missions at El Paso and Santa Fe.

In 1685 the coast of Texas was visited by Robert Cavelier de La Salle, who sailed from France with 4 ships and upward of 300 persons, to plant a colony at the mouth of the Mississippi. The fleet sailed too far to the westward, and entered Matagorda Bay. La Salle crossed the bay and ascended the Lavaca River, where he erected Fort St. Louis, since known as "Dimmit's Point." In March 1687 he was cruelly assassinated by one of his own men.

The first Spanish mission in east Texas was established in 1690 on the Neches River.

The first Spanish Governor of Texas was Don Domingo Teran de Los Rios, who was appointed in 1691.

In 1692 a village called San Fernando (now San Antonio) was begun near the head of the San Antonio River.

The Mission San Antonio de Valero was commenced on the Rio Grande in 1703 and removed to the San Antonio River in 1715 and to the plaza in the city in 1718.

In 1714 the Mission Nuestra Senora de Guadalupe was started on the Guadalupe River.

In 1715 was also commenced the missions at La Bahia, Nacogdoches on Ayish Bayou and at Adaes, on the east side of the Sabine.

San Antonio was erected into a presidio November 28, 1730, and the next year citizens for the new city were brought from the Canary Islands. The transportation of 16 families, consisting of 57 persons, cost the royal treasury \$72,000.

On March 5, 1731, was laid the foundation of La Purisima Concepcion, and a short time later the missions Las Espada, San Juan, and San Jose were commenced.

The foundation of the Alamo was laid in 1744.

In 1778 the foundation of the old stone house in Nacogdoches was laid, and in 1790 the Mission of Our Lady of Refuge, Refugio, was commenced. This was the last mission undertaken by the Franciscans in Texas. For a century they had labored for the civilization of the Indians. Some of their mission churches have disappeared. Other massive structures still stand, monuments to the religious zeal and enterprise of their founders.

Under the right of prior discovery by La Salle, the French still laid claim to Texas. By a royal charter, dated September 14, 1712, Louis XIV granted to Anthony Crozat the whole of Louisiana, including all the territory drained by the Mississippi. In 1718 the territory of Louisiana passed to the control of the Company of the Indies, of which John Law, the celebrated financier, was the leading spirit. In the latter part of this year, war broke out between France and Spain. As soon as this was known, St. Denis, who was in command at Natchitoches, collected a few soldiers for the invasion of Texas. The French expelled the Spaniards from Nacogdoches, and advanced as far as San Antonio. The controversy as to the ownership of Texas was kept up by different parties for more than a century.

In 1729 a number of powerful Indian tribes formed a coalition for the expulsion of all the Europeans from the country between the Mississippi and the Rio Grande. In 1732, Governor Bustillos organized a military expedition and chastised the savages, and secured peace to the settlements.

In 1762 France transferred her Louisiana possessions to Spain.

In 1800 Spain retroceded Louisiana to France, and in 1803 Bonaparte sold it to the United States.

At the close of the eighteenth century Texas had a population estimated at about 6,000, of which one-third were in San Antonio; and there were permanent settlements at Goliad, Nacogdoches, and other points.

The increasing prosperity of the American Republic and the claim that Texas was included in the purchase of Louisiana, excited the jealousy of the Spaniards, who adopted a proscriptive policy.

In 1800 Philip Nolan, Ellis P. Bean, and 18 others left Natchez, Miss., to hunt wild horses in Texas. Arriving on the high prairies, between the Trinity and the Brazos, Nolan halted and erected a block house. Lieutenant Musquez and about 100 Spanish soldiers attacked the house, and Nolan was killed. Bean was captured and sent to Mexico in irons.

In 1806, Lt. Zebulon M. Pike, of the United States Army, while on an exploring tour toward the headwaters of the Rio Grande, was discovered by the Mexicans, arrested, and sent home under an escort. The next year Colonel Freeman, sent out by President Jefferson to explore the Red River country, was also discovered by the Mexicans, arrested, and sent home.

In 1805 Governor Don Antonio Cordero advanced from La Bahia (now Goliad) to the Sabine with a military force to hold the country.

In 1812 Lt. Augustus W. Magee took possession of Nacogdoches. September following, with about 300 followers, he captured Goliad without a fight. Magee died February 1, 1813, and was succeeded in command by Samuel Kemper. This small army took the name of the Republican Army of the North, and started for San Antonio, where the Spaniards had been reinforced and numbered about 2,000. On the 5th of March, 1813, after severe fighting, the Spanish commander surrendered his sword to Kemper. A month later another Spanish army, said to number about 3,000, and after a siege, was defeated by the Republicans.

In 1819 Dr. James Long organized at Natchez an expedition for the invasion of Texas. He crossed the Sabine in June of that year. At Nacogdoches he organized a provisional government and sent detachments of soldiers to occupy the trading posts in eastern Texas. At Goliad Long was betrayed and taken to Mexico City. Later he was liberated, and soon afterward assassinated in that city.

Moses Austin, then a resident of Missouri, heard glowing descriptions of Texas, and resolved to apply to the proper authorities for permission to introduce 300 families into Texas. In pursuit of this scheme he visited San Antonio. At first he was ordered to leave the Province; and as he left the office of Governor Martinez he met Baron de Bastrop, an old friend he had known in Louisiana. Through the influence of Bastrop the Governor was induced not only to rescind the order for Austin's banishment, but to join the municipal officers of the city in recommending his project to General Arredondo at Monterey. Austin hastened back to make arrangements for introducing his colonists. Shortly after reaching Missouri, Austin died, leaving, however, a dying injunction that his son, Stephen F. Austin, should carry forward his plans.

Stephen F. Austin was in New Orleans when he heard of the success of his father's application, and he immediately started for Natchitoches, where he met the Mexican commissioner, Don Erasmo Seguin, sent there with the decree of Arredondo, and who was accompanied by Don Juan Veramendi. These Mexican gentlemen accompanied him to San Antonio, arriving there August 13, 1821, and he was cordially received by Governor Martinez. After examining the country, and choosing the region between the San Jacinto and Lavaca Rivers for a location, Stephen F. Austin returned to New Orleans. The schooner *Lively* was purchased and loaded with provisions, farming utensils, etc., and with 18 persons on board, sailed from New Orleans for Matagorda Bay November 20, 1821, and was never heard from afterward.

The same day the *Lively* left New Orleans Austin started for Texas by land, being joined at Natchitoches by 10 companions. The party reached the Brazos River the last day of the year. Austin hastened to the coast to meet the party of the *Lively*. For nearly 3 months he waited, when, receiving no tidings of the missing vessel, he finally gave her up for lost.

Introducing the 300 families required by the first contract, Austin, under the colonization law of April 1825, entered into another contract for 500 more. In 1827 he took a third contract for 100 families, and the next year a fourth for 300.

On the 18th of April 1825 Hayden Edwards took a contract for the introduction of 800 families into east Texas.

In 1826 Joseph Vehelin obtained a charter to colonize a large scope of country and was requested to introduce Swiss, Germans, and French.

At the same time David G. Burnet obtained a grant to colonize the region north of Vehelin's colony.

In 1829 Lorenzo de Zavala obtained a grant to colonize the country bordering upon the Sabine.

Martin de Leon obtained two contracts, the first in 1825 to introduce 41 families and the second in 1829 for 150 more, all to be located near the Guadalupe River. The territory still higher up the river was granted to Green DeWitt in 1825.

On the coast between the San Antonio and Nueces Rivers, Hewitson and Powers introduced some colonists, having in 1828 obtained a contract for 200 families. The same year McMullen and McGloin contracted to introduce a similar number into San Patricio County. Most of these latter colonists were Irish.

In 1830 Sterling C. Robertson and Alexander Thomson entered Texas with some colonists, but some difficulties arose with the Mexican authorities, and most of these families settled in Austin's

colony. Sterling C. Robertson was ordered to leave the province, but in April 1834, by decree he was reinstated as empresario, and succeeded in introducing some 300 families.

B. R. Milam was given a colonization grant, but disposed of his contract to Baring Bros., London, England.

General Filisola obtained a charter for colonizing the territory north of that given David G. Burnet, and the Red River country was given to John Cameron. Contracts were also awarded to Frost Thorn, Stephen J. Wilson, and Padilla and Chambers, but no steps were taken to settle the territory. West of the Nueces, in the State of Coahuila, Beale, and Grant introduced a few English colonists. After 1825 a large number of immigrants came to Texas on their own responsibility, selected homes and obtained titles to their land, under the provision of a general colonization law.

The law of 1824 guaranteed to foreigners settling in Texas security for their persons and property. Ten coast leagues and 20 leagues bordering on the United States were reserved from location. Under Austin's first contract, by previous agreement, the colonists were to pay 12½ cents an acre. This, however, was never collected.

The early inhabitants of Texas endured many privations. Meat could be procured by hunting, but families were sometimes for weeks without bread, and sugar and coffee were luxuries seldom obtainable. The men dressed mostly in buckskin, the women in such fabrics as could be obtained.

In Austin's colony, up to 1828, Austin himself exercised the functions of empresario. He held the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Mexican Army. He also held the office of supreme judge.

One of the first acts of the Mexican National Congress, assembled under the constitution of 1824, was the erection of former provinces into states similar to those of the American Union. Texas was connected temporarily with the neighboring State of Coahuila. The legislative body of the united state was called a congress, and was composed of 12 members, of whom Texas was entitled to 2. A representative, if not a native of Mexico, must have resided 8 years in the country, and was required to be worth \$8,000 or to have an income of \$1,000 annually. Popular elections were held on Sunday, the people not voting directly for the congressmen but for electors, who subsequently elected them.

On the 6th of April 1830, President Bustamante issued a proclamation prohibiting any further immigration into Texas from the United States. In 1831 customhouses were established at Nacogdoches, San Antonio, Copano, Velasco, and Anahuac. By decree of April 7, 1832, foreigners (meaning Americans) were forbidden to carry on a retail trade in the country, and a considerable body of troops were sent into Texas.

The first serious difficulty between the colonists and the military occurred at Anahuac, when Colonel Bradburn proclaimed martial law and arrested a number of citizens for whom he had conceived a dislike, and confined them in the barracks. By another military decree all the ports of Texas were closed, except Anahuac. It was not expected that Anglo-Americans, with their inborn love of liberty, would tamely submit to such outrages. Meetings were held and measures devised to effect the release of the prisoners in the stockade. A company was organized under the command of Francis W. Johnson, who demanded the immediate release of their fellow citizens. Bradburn refused to accede to the demand. General Piedras was approaching from Nacogdoches with reinforcements, and as soon as he ascertained the true state of affairs, superseded Bradburn (who immediately left for New Orleans) and released the prisoners. At this juncture, news arrived of a revolution in Mexico. Santa Anna had pronounced against Bustamante, and proclaimed anew the Constitution of 1824. A public meeting at Turtle Bayou June 13, 1832, gave a cordial assent to this republican movement. This placed the Americans in Texas in harmony with the Liberal Party of the Nation.

In the month of May, the assailing party at Anahuac needing cannon, went to Velasco to get two which were at that place, but Colonel Ugartechea declined to let the cannon pass Velasco. Volunteers were called for to capture the garrison, and 112 men responded. The cannon were placed on board the schooner *Brazoria*, in charge of Captain Russell, and floated down the river. Captain John Austin conducted the remainder by land. These, when they arrived at the mouth of the river, were formed into two companies. Captain Brown, with one company, took position near the beach. Captain Austin, under cover of darkness approached within a few rods of the fort, carrying palisades of plank for protection, and, working in silence, threw up temporary breastworks. The battle commenced about 12 o'clock at night, June 25, 1832. Just after daylight a shower of rain fell damaging the ammunition of the assailants. The party on the vessel kept up the fight, and the riflemen were especially successful in picking off gunners who mounted the parapet to fire the cannon. After 10 hours' fighting a white flag was raised in the fort, and the garrison surrendered. In the fight the Mexicans lost 35 killed and 15 wounded. The loss of the Texans was 8 killed and 27 wounded.

The attachment of Texas to Coahuila was inconvenient, unnatural, and in many respects, disadvantageous to Texas, which now had a population equal to that of the smaller states of Mexico. A convention was held in San Felipe de Austin in April 1833, and a constitution was drafted by Sam Houston. It was adopted and submitted to the national authorities for approval. Judge David G. Burnet drew up an able memorial, showing the disadvantages under which Texas labored, and the necessity for

a separate state government. The government refused to grant the Texans' request.

In 1834 Coahuila was convulsed with a revolution, which still more forcibly illustrated the necessity of separating Texas from Coahuila.

Perhaps Texas might have become and remained a Mexican State had the Mexicans maintained a republican form of government. But the Republic had disappeared, Santa Anna had abandoned the liberal party, and was making strides toward absolute power. The constitution of 1824 had been swept away, and the mass of the people disarmed.

The revolution in Mexico was completed on the 3d of October 1835. The state of chaos in Coahuila left Texas comparatively without civil government. At this period, when the public mind was unsettled, Austin, who had been in prison in Mexico reappeared in Texas, having been released from his long confinement.

Gonzales has been denominated the Lexington of Texas. A cannon had been given the citizens for defense against the Indians. Colonel Ugartechea, in command at San Antonio, sent Captain Castanado, with 150 men to seize this gun and carry it to San Antonio. The Texans rallied under Capt. Albert Martin, and resolved to retain it. By the 1st of October the Texan force at Gonzales had increased to 168. John H. Moore was elected colonel. The Texans manned the cannon and went out to attack Castanado. The fight opened with the discharge of the cannon, when the Mexicans precipitately retreated toward San Antonio, and the Texans returned in triumph to Gonzales.

On October 8, the Texans, under Captain George Collingsworth, attacked and captured Goliad, taking 25 prisoners, several pieces of artillery, 300 stands of arms, and about \$10,000 in money.

On the 6th day of November 1835 the independence of Texas was declared, and on the 12th a provisional government was organized, with Henry Smith for Governor; James W. Robinson, Lieutenant Governor; and Sam Houston, commander in chief of the regular army.

The Texans, who, had, on the first alarm of war, gallantly repulsed Castanado, were not prepared for a regular campaign, and many of them soon returned to their homes. Those remaining in camp were without a recognized leader. In the contingency General Austin was selected as commander in chief.

At San Antonio the Mexican garrison had been strengthened by the arrival of General Cos and numbered about 1,000 men. This city was Austin's objective point. With his army he crossed the Guadalupe River and on the 20th of October he arrived at the Mission La Espada, 9 miles from the city. He sent a detachment of 92 men, under Colonels Bowie and Fannin, to reconnoiter and if possible select a camping ground near the city. On the morning of the 28th this detachment found themselves confronted on 3 sides by 400 Mexican soldiers. After some severe fighting the Mexicans retreated to the city, leaving their 6-pounder on the field. In this engagement the Texans had one man killed. The Mexicans' loss was not accurately known, but 16 dead bodies were lying near the abandoned cannon, which had been fired but 4 times.

On November 28, General Austin, who had been appointed Commissioner to the United States, resigned the command of the army, and was succeeded by General Burleson.

On December 5 the Texans, under General Burleson, Colonel Neil, Col. Ben Milam, and F. W. Johnson, began an assault upon the city of San Antonio, which continued for several days, during which time Colonel Milam was killed. General Cos, the Mexican commander, on the morning of the 9th of December, surrendered the city and the Alamo to the Texans.

On December 10 the executive council passed a decree ordering an election of delegates to a general convention. The 22 municipalities were to elect 56 delegates; the election to be held on the 1st of February 1836, and the convention to meet in Washington-on-the-Brazos on the 1st of March.

It was soon discovered that the executive council was too unwieldy for prompt action. A rupture occurred, and on the 11th of January the council, by a unanimous vote, deposed Governor Smith, and installed Lieutenant Governor Robinson as Governor. The Governor declined to surrender his office, and a wordy controversy ensued, which was protracted until the meeting of the convention in Washington-on-the-Brazos.

The delegates to the convention assembled on the 1st of March. Richard Ellis was elected president and H. S. Kimble, secretary. On the second day of the session a declaration of independence was unanimously adopted. By the 15th a constitution had been prepared, and on the 16th a government ad interim was inaugurated, with David G. Burnet for president and Lorenzo de Zavala vice president. Sam Houston was appointed commander in chief of the forces in the field. The convention adjourned on the 17th, and a few days afterward President Burnet and the members of his cabinet removed to Harrisburg.

Texas was now the only Mexican province that disputed the authority of Santa Anna, and he immediately began preparations for its subjugation. He sent his main army across the Rio Grande at Presidio, and thence to San Antonio, while a supporting column advanced along the coast from Matamoros to Goliad. Santa Anna arrived at Saltillo, Mexico, toward the last of January 1836. On the 16th of February he was at Guerrero. The advance of the army reached the heights of the Alazan, overlooking the city of San Antonio, on the 22d of February. On the approach of the Mexicans Col. W. B. Travis, with 144 men, retired to the Alamo.

Santa Anna sent a summons to the garrison to surrender. This was answered by a cannon shot from the battery. Travis had 14 cannon but only a limited supply of ammunition. A blood-red flag, proclaiming "No quarters", floated over the church in the city.

On the 24th Travis dispatched couriers to San Felipe and to Goliad for help. The Mexicans bombarded the fort without effect.

The siege was kept up for several days. On March 2 Capt. John W. Smith with 32 citizen-soldiers from Gonzales, forced their way through the Mexican lines and entered the fort. On the 3rd Col. J. B. Bonham, who had been sent to Goliad for reinforcements, returned and rejoined his companions in the fort. On Sunday morning, March 6, the 13th day of the siege, the Alamo fell, every man dying at his post. The only persons spared were Mrs. Dickinson and her little daughter, Mrs. Alsbury and child, and a Negro belonging to Travis. The garrison numbered about 180. The loss of the enemy was 521, with a like number wounded. Santa Anna's assaulting force numbered between 4,000 and 6,000.

On March 17 Fannin, with several pieces of artillery and about 400 men, was en route to Victoria, from Goliad, and when on Coleta Creek was attacked by the Mexicans under Urrea. Urrea received heavy reinforcements, including a park of artillery. Without adequate protection against the enemy's cannon, destitute of water, and surrounded by an army five times as large as their own, the Texans saw no alternative but to surrender. A white flag was hoisted, and terms of capitulation agreed upon.

The prisoners were marched back to Goliad and confined in the old mission. Most of these prisoners were from Georgia, and constituted what was known as the "Georgia battalion." On the night of March 26 a messenger arrived from Santa Anna with orders for their execution. This order was faithfully executed the next morning, Palm Sunday, March 27. Without warning the privates, in four columns, were simultaneously marched out in different directions, each one strongly guarded. When at a short distance from the fort, at a given signal, all were halted and shot. The most of them were killed instantly. Some, who were only wounded, were dispatched with sabers, and a few, by feigning death, escaped it. After the privates had been put to death the officers and wounded were murdered in the fort. All the bodies were left unburied, though partially burned in a brush fence. Eight physicians and attendants were spared; 27 made their escape; 330 were slain.

After the capture of San Antonio and Goliad, Santa Anna considered Texas subjugated, and intended to return home, leaving his generals to reestablish Mexican laws and institutions, but Almonte and Filisola, two of his ablest generals, reminded the President that all the Texans thus far encountered were recent volunteers from the United States, and that the real strength of the colonists was unimpaired. Feeling the force of these observations, Santa Anna prepared to push three columns into the heart of the country.

Gen. Sam Houston arrived at Gonzales on the 11th of March, and found 500 men in the army, most of whom had been in the campaign of 1835. That same evening he received news of the fall of the Alamo, and the expected advance of Santa Anna. As his force was inadequate to cope with the enemy, he ordered a retreat. This was commenced about midnight March 12, the families removing with the army. The Texans crossed the Nueces River on the 14th, and the Colorado on the 17th. When he crossed the Colorado, Houston's army had increased to 600 men. He remained on the east side of the river, at the old Atascosita Crossing (Columbus) until the 25th, and recruits continued to arrive until he had an army of 1,200 to 1,500 men. On the 26th the Texans took up the line of march for San Felipe, where instead of crossing the river, Houston changed his course up the stream, and camped in the Brazos bottom from the 29th of March until the 12th of April. On the day Houston encamped on the Brazos, Santa Anna started the bulk of the central column from San Antonio, and with his personal staff arrived at Columbus on the 5th of April. Leaving the heavy ordnance and most of the infantry to follow he hastened on and reached San Felipe on the 7th. A small company of determined Texans, under Capt. Mosely Baker, disputed the passage of the river, and Santa Anna turned down to seek another crossing. He arrived at Cole's on the Bernard on the 9th, rested on the 10th, and sent out a foraging party to procure supplies of corn, etc.

On the 12th Santa Anna reached Richmond, and captured a ferryboat. On the 15th, late at night, the Mexicans reached Harrisburg. After remaining there 2 days, he marched his advanced column down to New Washington, and on the morning of the 20th he started a small boat, loaded with provisions, up to Lynchburg, where he intended to cross his army and march eastward. The boat fell into the hands of the Texans and furnished an acceptable supply to hungry soldiers. That morning Santa Anna's scouts notified him of the arrival of Houston's army at Lynchburg. About the middle of the day the Mexican scouts came in sight of the camp of the Texans and by the middle of the afternoon the whole force, with the commander, had arrived and camped within a mile of the Texans.

Toward evening the artillery of the Mexicans, supported by the cavalry, was deployed in front and a little to the right of the Texans' camp. General Sherman, in command of the Texas cavalry, marched out to repel the threatened attack. The discharge of the Texan cannon, and the gallant charge of Sherman, checked the advance of the enemy.

About 9 o'clock on the morning of April 21, 1836, General Cos arrived with 500 additional troops, swelling Santa Anna's force to about 1,600 men. To meet this army Houston had only 783

men. Erasmus (Deaf) Smith was dispatched to Vince's Bridge, across a bayou. The whole Mexican army had crossed this bridge, and knew of no other chance to retreat. About 4 o'clock in the afternoon, the Texans attacked Santa Anna's forces, rushing impetuously upon the foe, shouting "Remember the Alamo!" "Remember Goliad!"

The Mexicans were not expecting an attack at that late hour in the day. Many of them were taking their evening siesta. Even Santa Anna was asleep. Before their lines could be formed the Texans were over their breastworks, taking their cannon. The battle lasted only a few minutes, but the victory was complete. As "Deaf" Smith had destroyed Vince's bridge, the Mexicans could not escape. The Texans lost 8 killed and 25 wounded. The loss of the Mexicans was 630 killed, 208 wounded, and 730 prisoners, including the President of Mexico. The Texans captured all of the artillery and camp stores of the enemy and the military chest containing \$12,000 in specie.

After the decisive battle of San Jacinto, things moved rapidly toward the successful establishment of the Republic of Texas. On July 23, President Burnet issued a proclamation ordering an election for President, Vice President, and members of Congress. The people were also to vote on the adoption of the constitution, which had been framed by the convention in March, and also on the question of annexation. The unsettled state of Mexico secured Texas from danger from that quarter. Santa Anna was still held a prisoner, but after the meeting of Congress in October his irons were removed, and after the adjournment of that body, General Houston released him and sent him, at his own request, to Washington, D. C.

At the election held in September, Sam Houston was elected president and M. B. Lamar, vice president. The constitution was adopted by an almost unanimous vote, and the vote was equally strong for annexation. Congress met at Columbia on October 3. On October 22 Generals Houston and Lamar were duly installed in their respective offices.

Thus closed the revolutionary period of Texas, the darkest and the brightest period in Texas history.

At the election held September 3, 1838, Mirabeau B. Lamar was elected president, and David G. Burnet, vice president.

In 1841 Sam Houston was elected President and Edward Burleson, Vice President.

In 1844 Anson Jones was elected President, and Kenneth L. Anderson, Vice President. President Jones convened an extra session of Congress on the 16th of June 1845, and this body promptly passed a bill assenting to annexation with the United States. A convention met in Austin on July 4, 1845, on the same day Congress passed the annexation bill. This, with a new constitution, was submitted to a vote of the people October 13.

On the third Monday in December a general election was held for State officers and members of the legislature. That body assembled in Austin, and on the 19th of February 1846, Anson Jones, the last President of the Republic of Texas, handed over the executive authority to J. Pinckney Henderson, first Governor of the State of Texas. On December 29, 1845, President Polk signed the bill extending the laws of the United States over Texas; and the same day Governor Henderson was inaugurated, the Postal Service of the Union was extended over the State, and the custom-houses and other public property of the late Republic relinquished to the United States. Thus annexation was consummated, and the Lone Star, the emblem of the youngest born of republics, was merged in the constellation of the American Union.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not want 5 minutes; I just want to express my deep appreciation to the members of this committee for the recent vote and to say that all those who voted against us did so for what they considered a good reason; but you come down to Texas, and we will forget all about that vote, and we will show you where the sons of your own States enacted a drama upon that stage as heroic as devotion and courage and capacity ever placed within the opportunity of any generation.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GILLETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 131, pursuant to House Resolution 264, he reported the same to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts moves to recommit the Senate joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

"On page 6, line 4, strike out '\$3,000,000' and insert '\$1,500,000.'"

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 39, noes 86.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. The previous question having been ordered, if the House were to adjourn now, this vote would be the first order of business on Monday, would it not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 88, nays 188, answered "present" 2, not voting 151, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—88

Amlie	Ekwall	Kinzer	Reilly
Andresen	Engel	Lemke	Robison, Ky.
Andrew, Mass.	Fenerty	Luckey	Rogers, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.	Fiesinger	Ludlow	Sauthoff
Arends	Focht	McKeough	Schneider
Blackney	Ford, Miss.	McLeod	Scott
Boileau	Fuller	Maas	Short
Bolton	Gehrman	Mapes	Snell
Brewster	Gilchrist	Martin, Mass.	Stewart
Buckbee	Goodwin	Michener	Taber
Carlson	Gwynne	Millard	Tarver
Christianson	Halleck	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Church	Hancock, N. Y.	Mott	Thom
Colmer	Harlan	O'Brien	Thomas
Cooper, Ohio	Hess	O'Neal	Treadway
Crawford	Hoffman	Patterson	Turpin
Darrow	Holmes	Pearson	Wigglesworth
Deen	Hope	Peterson, Ga.	Wolfenden
Ditter	Hull	Powers	Wolverton
Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Rabaut	Woodruff
Duffey, Ohio	Kenney	Reed, Ill.	Young
Eicher	Kimball	Reed, N. Y.	Zioncheck

NAYS—188

Ashbrook	Cullen	Hildebrandt	McFarlane
Ayers	Cummings	Hill, Ala.	McGehee
Barden	Daly	Hill, Knute	McGrath
Beiter	Delaney	Hill, Samuel B.	McLaughlin
Biermann	Dies	Hobbs	McReynolds
Bland	Dingell	Hook	Mahon
Blanton	Dobbins	Houston	Maloney
Bloom	Dockweiler	Huddleston	Mansfield
Boland	Doughton	Imhoff	Martin, Colo.
Boylan	Doxey	Jacobsen	Mason
Brown, Ga.	Driver	Jenckes, Ind.	Massingale
Brunner	Duffy, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Maverick
Buchanan	Dunn, Pa.	Johnson, Tex.	Merritt, N. Y.
Buck	Eagle	Johnson, W. Va.	Montague
Buckler, Minn.	Eaton	Jones	Nelson
Burdick	Eckert	Kee	O'Connor
Caldwell	Faddis	Keller	O'Day
Cannon, Mo.	Farley	Kennedy, Md.	O'Leary
Cannon, Wis.	Ferguson	Kennedy, N. Y.	Patton
Carpenter	Fitzpatrick	Kerr	Peterson, Fla.
Cartwright	Flannagan	Kieberg	Pfeifer
Cary	Fletcher	Kloeb	Pierce
Castellow	Ford, Calif.	Kniffin	Pittenger
Chandler	Gasque	Knutson	Plumley
Chapman	Gavagan	Kocialkowski	Quinn
Citron	Gillette	Kramer	Ramspeck
Coffee	Gray, Ind.	Kvale	Rankin
Colden	Green	Lambertson	Rayburn
Cole, Md.	Greenway	Lambeth	Reece
Collins	Greener	Lanham	Richards
Connery	Gregory	Lea, Calif.	Richardson
Cooper, Tenn.	Griswold	Lee, Okla.	Robinson, Utah
Costello	Guyer	Lesinski	Rogers, Okla.
Cox	Haines	Lewis, Colo.	Romjue
Crosby	Hamlin	Lloyd	Rudd
Cross, Tex.	Hart	Lundeen	Ryan
Crosser, Ohio	Harter	McAndrews	Sadowski
Crowe	Hennings	McCormack	Sanders, La.

Sanders, Tex.	South	Thurston	Weaver
Schaefer	Spence	Tinkham	Welch
Schulte	Starnes	Tonry	Werner
Secrest	Steagall	Turner	West
Shanley	Sullivan	Umstead	White
Smith, Va.	Summers, Tex.	Utterback	Whittington
Smith, Wash.	Taylor, Colo.	Vinson, Ky.	Wilcox
Smith, W. Va.	Taylor, S. C.	Wadsworth	Williams
Snyder	Thomason	Wallgren	Wilson, La.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Sweeney

Truax

NOT VOTING—151

Adair	Dietrich	Larrabee	Randolph
Allen	Dirksen	Lehlbach	Ransley
Arnold	Disney	Lewis, Md.	Rich
Bacharach	Dorsey	Lord	Robertson
Bacon	Doutrich	Lucas	Rogers, N. H.
Bankhead	Drewry	McClellan	Russell
Beam	Driscoll	McGroarty	Sabath
Bell	Duncan	McLean	Sandlin
Berlin	Dunn, Miss.	McMillan	Schuetz
Binderup	Edmiston	McSwain	Scrugham
Boehne	Ellenbogen	Marcantonio	Sears
Brennan	Englebright	Marshall	Seger
Brooks	Evans	May	Shannon
Brown, Mich.	Fernandez	Mead	Sirovich
Buckley, N. Y.	Fish	Meeks	Sisson
Bulwinkle	Frey	Merritt, Conn.	Smith, Conn.
Burch	Fulmer	Miller	Somers, N. Y.
Burnham	Gambrill	Mitchell, Ill.	Stack
Carmichael	Gassaway	Monaghan	Stefan
Carter	Gearhart	Montet	Stubbs
Casey	Gifford	Moran	Sutphin
Cavacchia	Gildea	Moritz	Terry
Celler	Gingery	Murdock	Thompson
Claiborne	Goldsborough	Nichols	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Granfield	Norton	Tolan
Clark, N. C.	Gray, Pa.	O'Connell	Underwood
Cochran	Greenwood	Oliver	Vinson, Ga.
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock, N. C.	O'Malley	Walter
Cooley	Hartley	Owen	Warren
Corning	Healey	Palmisano	Wearin
Cravens	Higgins, Conn.	Parks	Whelchel
Crowther	Higgins, Mass.	Parsons	Wilson, Pa.
Culkin	Hoeppel	Patman	Withrow
Darden	Hollister	Perkins	Wolcott
Dear	Kahn	Pettengill	Wood
Dempsey	Kelly	Peyser	Woodrum
DeRoven	Kopplemann	Polk	Zimmerman
Dickstein	Lamneck	Ramsay	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Cole of New York (for) with Mr. Randolph (against).
 Mr. Halleck (for) with Mr. Patman (against).
 Mr. Marshall (for) with Mr. Lewis of Maryland (against).
 Mr. Hollister (for) with Mr. Frey (against).
 Mr. Ransley (for) with Mr. Russell (against).
 Mr. Granfield (for) with Mr. Dorsey (against).
 Mr. Tobey (for) with Mr. Mead (against).
 Mr. Wolcott (for) with Mr. Sabath (against).
 Mr. Bacon (for) with Mr. Scrugham (against).
 Mr. Parsons (for) with Mr. Somers of New York (against).
 Mr. Culkin (for) with Mr. Celler (against).
 Mr. Seger (for) with Mr. Kopplemann (against).
 Mr. Lord (for) with Mr. Dear (against).
 Mr. Gifford (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
 Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. McSwain (against).
 Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. Palmisano (against).
 Mr. Bacharach (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).
 Mr. McLean (for) with Mr. Buckley of New York (against).
 Mr. Cavichia (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
 Mr. Lehlbach (for) with Mr. Evans (against).
 Mr. Merritt of Connecticut (for) with Mr. Gambrill (against).
 Mr. Perkins (for) with Mr. Mitchell of Illinois (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Warren with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Allen.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
 Mr. Arnold with Mrs. Kahn.
 Mr. Boehne with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. Oliver with Mr. Stefan.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Gearhart.
 Mr. Parks with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Burnham.
 Mr. Sears with Mr. Englebright.
 Mr. Robertson with Mr. Marcantonio.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Gildea.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Sisson.
 Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Duncan.
 Mr. Moritz with Mr. Daly.
 Mr. Claiborne with Mr. McClellan.
 Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Binderup.
 Mr. Lucas with Mr. Lamneck.
 Mr. Adair with Mr. Stack.
 Mr. Healey with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.

Mr. May with Mr. Brooks.
 Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Edmiston.
 Mr. Polk with Mr. Disney.
 Mr. O'Connell with Mr. Larrabee.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. Meeks with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Brennan with Mr. Clark of North Carolina.
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Nichols.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Cooley.
 Mr. Berlin with Mr. Cravens.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. O'Malley.
 Mr. Darden with Mr. Moran.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Dempsey.
 Mr. Ramsay with Mr. DeRouen.
 Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Gasque.
 Mr. Dietrich with Mr. Murdock.
 Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Owen.
 Mr. Driscoll with Mr. Ellenbogen.
 Mr. Dunn of Mississippi with Mr. Fernandez.
 Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts with Mr. Hoeppel.
 Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Terry.
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Walter.
 Mr. Smith of Connecticut with Mr. Raubert.
 Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Stubbs.
 Mr. Wearin with Mr. Wheelchel.
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Underwood.
 Mr. Gingery with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. DINGELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. RUSSELL, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay" on the motion to recommit.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House resolution (H. J. Res. 293) was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7672) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate no. 18 to the foregoing bill.

"GRASS ROOTS" CONVENTION AT SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech which I made over the radio last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made over the radio last Sunday:

Less than 2 weeks ago I had the privilege of attending a great patriotic gathering. I refer to the so-called "grass roots" convention at Springfield, Ill., where some 20,000 men and women voluntarily assembled for the purpose of holding conference with each other. They were there for the further purpose of figuratively sitting at the feet of the great Lincoln in order that from the memory of his character and wisdom they might obtain guidance for their own course in another critical period of the Nation's history.

There were close to 8,000 accredited delegates, my home State of Minnesota sending some 300 to the prairie States conference.

Had the invitation been more general and the preliminary preparations covered a longer period of time, I doubt if the Illinois capital could have held all that would have come.

I have seen many political conventions and gatherings of a various nature but I have never seen anything so impressive as the "grass roots" conference.

The times, the critical condition of our national affairs, the necessity of meeting a situation with courage and with wisdom, all conspired to make of this unofficial conference something a great deal out of the ordinary. Throughout the history of the gathering pervaded the spirit of the martyr President. Lincoln's tomb is in Springfield. Illinois was his home State and one cannot move in that region without discovering something which recalls his simple but magnificently successful life. However, the greatest monument ever reared to Lincoln is the memory that

remains of his life. The greatest lesson he extends today is the courage, the sanity, and the honest naturalness with which he grappled with the problems of his own time. They, too, were unusual. There was no charted course to guide him except the letter and spirit of the American Constitution. With that went the history of our people, the traditions that have acquired the force of law, the devotion with which men and women in every crisis have given their all—first to establish the conditions of the American Nation, and then to maintain them.

During the time I was in Springfield I visited the little log settlement of New Salem, where Lincoln spent his early manhood. I shall always be glad that I did this. From that visit I received an insight into the history of Lincoln, into the meaning and purpose of his life, that I think I never would have obtained elsewhere.

The little hamlet, resting in the bend of the Sangamon River, is an exact replica of the frontier settlement in which Lincoln mastered surveying, in which he sold calico and brown sugar over the counter of his little store, where he gazed at the stars, and where he grieved over the loss of his first sweetheart, Ann Rutledge. The place has been restored by William Randolph Hearst, who, in doing so, has contributed richly to the traditional history of our country.

Gazing at these log buildings, and looking into the window of the little store in which Lincoln worked, one gathers the immensity of the solitude in which this great natural genius must have dwelt. Here is the spirit of American frontier life in which Lincoln battled his own way. Here were the grass roots of his own time. The people who dwelt there with him were simple people. They were the Nation's advance guard, reflecting the emotions of their times and struggling with a poverty which made them sympathetic with all the aspirations of the human soul. Lincoln was a part of all this. In these conditions he reflected upon the mysteries of life, and with an analytical power never excelled, studied and evaluated the issues of the day.

The problems of every age are new and peculiar to their time. Yet there is a relationship between all of them, and there is a unity in history that cannot be avoided. In our American history we can no more determine upon a course, or make a political decision without regard to the past than can a man forget the influences which have made him what he is at the moment, and then start all anew as if the past had never been.

It is this unity which made the influence of Abraham Lincoln so all-pervasive at this remarkable gathering. Here were the representatives of a great political party, born out of the travail of the struggle for human freedom. That party had, under the leadership of Lincoln, fought a great war, first that the Declaration of Independence concept, that all men are created equal, should be made a reality, and secondly that the Nation built up under the Constitution should survive. For almost 60 years, with slight intermissions, the party organization of which Lincoln was a chief founder, has borne the responsibilities of a great National Government during a period of unprecedented national progress.

This particular conference found the party in a period of defeat. Found it chastened by misfortune. Yet found it equally devoted and as unselfishly so as when Lincoln led it to its first embattled victory.

Another great Illinoian was a spokesman for the gathering. Frank O. Lowden has a record of probably having been the greatest Governor this country has yet produced. The study of his administration is a triumph of efficiency. Today he emerges like Cincinnatus of old, from his farm home—America's elder statesman, devoted to his country, and willing to give of the latter years of his life to the preservation of its best qualities. Lowden is of the West. He has long understood its problems, and his championship of western agriculture is of long standing. Like Lincoln, Lowden is a self-made man. Born in Minnesota he early emerged from the poverty which remained with Lincoln as a badge of distinction up to the time he entered the Presidency.

With something of the Lincolnian power of keen analysis, Governor Lowden applied the scalpel to the new deal, and when he had finished he had a shouting audience enthusiastically acclaiming the sound common sense with which he had examined our present-day programs.

The "grass roots" convention was not an official body. It had no authority to speak for the Republican Party. On the other hand, it represented the prairie States section of the Union, and this viewpoint, as expressed in a tentative platform, voiced the liberal and wise point of view of the Middle West. It was out of this section that the fire and enthusiasm of the early Republican Party found its voice, its inspiration, and its leadership. It is natural that again from this section, where the American home folk still dwell, there should come the new dedication to duty and patriotic service.

Party lines have been loosened greatly in this day of the radio and of quick interchange of thought and views. Nevertheless, party organization is essential and while the Republican Party may have been beaten, it has not lost its splendid courage and its high ideals. This was demonstrated at the Springfield meeting.

The platform commits the party to a forceful stand for social justice, for liberal policies, for social security, for the protection of American agriculture, and for an adequate tariff policy which will protect the man on the farm and in the shop.

It places the Republican Party in the position of intelligent and constructive criticism of the new-deal politics, which, after 2 years of reckless brainstorming experimentation, finds unemploy-

ment continuing, of governmental expenditures increasing, and an insidious opposition to the constitutional provisions of the Government without which there can be no real America for you and me.

Instead of a philosophical acceptance of the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, we find the administration in our Nation's Capital obstinately discussing the advisability of a centralized bureaucratic government in Washington, which would wipe out State lines and obliterate the local character of our Government, under which union has been possible and progress made possible.

It was a notable fact at this conference that it was a woman who "stole the show." Mrs. Simmons, a Democratic farm woman from Missouri, made the speech which probably stirred more genuine enthusiasm than any other, not even excepting the masterly address given by Frank Lowden.

Another notable feature of the convention was the presence there of several thousand Jeffersonian Democrats. They came to pledge their support to the Republicans in making a fight to retain our constitutional form of government. They made it plain they did not come as converts to Republicanism. They remain Democrats. But, first and foremost, they are American citizens.

It was the Democratic following of Stephen A. Douglas that made possible the success of Lincoln's program. It would be a singular duplication of history if it were the Democrats of today who, by patriotic disinterestedness, make it possible to retain our orderly process of government and sustain the Constitution for which Webster argued and Lincoln fought.

The declaration of principles adopted at the Springfield gathering is the most momentous ever to be ratified at any unofficial political gathering in all the history of the Republic. They declare unequivocally for the rights of the States and against undue encroachment on the part of the Federal Government. They reaffirm our beliefs in the rights of the individual, and they pledge the Republican Party to carry out the principles of Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, Blaine, and Theodore Roosevelt. These principles have restored the confidence of the American people in representative government.

"GRASS ROOTS" RESOLUTIONS—DECLARATION OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES INCLUDES PLEDGE TO FIGHT FOR PRESERVATION OF STATE RIGHTS

The text of the report of the Resolutions Committee to the Republican "Grass Roots" Conference follows:

Declaration of principles:

The conference of Republicans of the Middle Western States offers reverent gratitude to Almighty God for the wisdom, courage, and faith of our forefathers, who established on American soil and, through sacrifice and far-sighted vision, have maintained the eternal principles of human rights and human liberties.

We renew our faith in those principles and solemnly rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation for our posterity of the blessings which have accrued to us from their establishment and maintenance.

HOLD STATE RIGHTS VITAL

These American principles are the basis of Republican creed and Republican policies, and we translate these principles into some, but not all, of the policies which we favor. We make no pretense of attempting to write a platform, but we urge the consideration of the matters herein stated by the proper representatives of the Republican Party.

Republican creed:

We believe in the Constitution of the United States.

We believe that the constitutional separation of the powers of government into legislative, executive, and judicial should be maintained.

We believe that the maintenance of the independent sovereignties of the Federal Government and the several States, as guaranteed by the Constitution, is vital to the maintenance of our American system of government, and we reaffirm the wisdom of our forefathers, who reserved to the States their power over matters of intrastate and local concern and delegated to the Federal Government certain power over specified matters of national concern.

PRaises ECONOMIC SITUATION

We believe in the maintenance of our American political and economic systems as established by our forefathers and developed over a century and a half of unparalleled progress.

We believe that they are sufficiently flexible to meet all of the needs of a complex civilization, while preserving those enduring principles derived from the accumulated experience of mankind.

We believe that our present troubles are not due to any inherent defects in our American system, and can be effectively dealt with within the framework of our Constitution.

We believe that a free press, open discussion, and honest criticism are essential to the preservation of free institutions.

We believe in individualism and in individual enterprise, as opposed to communism, socialism, fascism, or any other form of collectivism, no matter in what form it masquerades, whether as a "new deal", a "planned economy", or otherwise.

FREE ENTERPRISE FAVORED

We believe that our American system of free enterprise is the one, above all others, capable of providing the great mass of the people with a substantially higher standard of living and greater economic security, without loss of freedom, through an ever-

widening distribution of property ownership among American families.

We believe that the successful functioning of the American system demands that the competitive system be maintained and fostered and that individual initiative be encouraged.

We believe that once economic freedom is destroyed, political liberty must suffer the same fate, and that aside from its contribution to material progress, there is a moral value to liberty which justifies any sacrifice to preserve it.

We recognize and approve the principle of collective bargaining, the representatives of labor to be of labor's own choice. We are opposed to the employment of women in industry, that their health and welfare may be safeguarded. We are firmly committed to the principles that wages in America must be kept consistent with American standards. We recognize that the maintenance of the American standard of living of the wage earner is an essential element of national recovery.

OLD-AGE RESERVES FAVORED

We recognize that the security of our citizens demands Government aid in the establishment of old-age and unemployment reserves.

We are grateful for the valiant and sacrificing service of our men of all wars and pledge ourselves to see that justice is accorded them.

We believe that the resources of our country and the enterprise and industry of our citizens are such that the existence of an immense and permanent class of dependents is as unnecessary in the future as in the past; that Americans will continue to demand work at decent wages, not the dole of public charity, and that this demand can be generally and promptly met once American industry is freed from the uncertainties of indefensible experiments and the attempt to force American life into new and alien molds.

We believe in the equality of economic opportunity for all men, irrespective of race or color, in accord with the humanitarian beliefs of Abraham Lincoln.

We believe it to be our duty to accept the challenge of the defeatists who would repudiate our country's past, and betray its future, and to appeal to our countrymen to rally to the defense of American institutions.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Governmental policies:

Guided by the principles expressed in our Republican creed, we advocate the following:

1. The immediate adoption of a policy of economy and thrift in Government with due allowance for essential relief expenditures as opposed to the present spending policy of waste and extravagance.

2. The prompt attainment of a balanced Budget, not by the misleading method of double bookkeeping but by the honest method of bringing the expenses of the Government within the limits of its income.

3. A sound currency based on gold and definitely stabilized by Congress so that individual enterprise may have confidence in the future value of the dollar, in terms of which every man's plans for his present or future must necessarily be made. This is a necessary foundation of enduring national recovery.

Every effort should be made to extend this stabilization so that it will be international in character.

4. The immediate withdrawal of Government from competition with private industry.

5. The maintenance of the vitality and free growth of American industry through the preservation of the competitive system, protected against monopoly by the vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws so that small businesses may be preserved and the door of equal opportunity kept open to all.

6. The rigid enforcement of all laws, civil and criminal, to prevent and punish dishonest or unfair practices in business, industry, and finance; this is essential to the conduct of legitimate business and the protection of our people.

STAND FOR AGRICULTURE

7. National recognition of the needs of agriculture. Agriculture is a fundamental industry of the United States. No high standard of living can be attained or long enjoyed which is indifferent to agriculture. The farmer combines in one the functions of capital, management, and labor. He constitutes that class, the decline of which throughout the history of all nations has been followed by national disintegration. Any program for national security must inevitably start with agriculture. We hold that no economic advantage of agriculture thus far attained shall be surrendered.

The farmer is, of right, entitled to a fair and proportionate part of the national income and to receive a parity price for the products of his farm in domestic markets. Recognizing these facts, we endorse the enactment of such legislation, approved by the farmers themselves, as will accomplish such purposes. While it is recognized that agricultural products will suffer certain price fluctuations, the same as in the case of other business, we hold that the stabilization of the farm market will go further than anything else toward the stabilization of all business and the elimination of recurring panics and depressions with their tragedies of bankruptcy and unemployment. We endorse the statement of Governor Lowden in this conference that so long as we have a protective tariff for the benefit of industry we should give to agriculture corresponding benefits for that portion of the products

of the soil which goes into domestic consumption. We further recommend research by the Government looking to the creation of new outlets in industry for agricultural products. The machinery of Federal land bank loans should be used to refinance farm mortgage debts at low rates of interest.

"WORK FOR THE WORKERS"

8. Work for the workers. With men out of work, as now, the capital structure of the Nation is not only being impaired, but undermined. Willful, wanton, and reckless spending of our people's moneys are likewise undermining the physical assets of our nationals. The vitality and the integrity of our economic laws grow out to the formula of nature's processes. Naturally, there is an economic fraternalism between the farm, industry, and all workers. Working together that great trinity can make, and always will make for the peace, happiness, and an ever-increasing prosperity of all our people. Radicals and reactionaries always have and probably always will make for unbalancing the advantages of the working together of this healthy trinity. It is for this reason the policies of such trouble makers never can prevail to the proving point of such process. The Republican Party, since Lincoln, progressively gave the workingman the full dinner pail, a living wage, and a saving wage. We now pledge ourselves to the encouragement of an economic fraternalism between the trinity of farm, workers, and industry that will enable the workers to earn and receive work for the workers at protective wages.

9. The breaking down of arbitrary restrictions that throttle world commerce, such as quotas and exchanges restrictions. They, and not reasonable tariffs, are the real enemies of world trade.

10. Continued protection to farm and home ownership, and continued provision, in cooperation with State and local governments, for those that are in need until private enterprise absorbs the present army of unemployed. We urge these policies as means of ending the depression. By their adoption the wheels of commerce and industry will begin to turn, and relief rolls will be reduced, the unemployed will find work at fair wages through private enterprise, and hope and happiness will reenter the American home.

EAGLE PASS & PIEDRAS NEGRAS BRIDGE CO.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2326) to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Eagle Pass & Piedras Negras Bridge Co. a portion of the Eagle Pass Military Reservation, Tex., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. McREYNOLDS submitted a conference report (Rept. No. 1282) on the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make new reports on those bills reported by the Library Committee and to which members of the Claims Committee objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to submit supplemental reports on various bills reported by his committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DIGEST—EIGHT-PAGE SUMMARY FOR BUSY READERS—DIGEST ON INDEX PLAN PRACTICAL

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the daily RECORD covering the second session of the Seventy-third Congress averaged about 94 pages. Many of us have experienced considerable difficulty in going over a RECORD of this size every day. For some time I have been thinking of the advisability of a daily index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am assured by those who know that it can be done. I would suggest that an 8-page digest of the RECORD be made daily.

DAILY DIGEST AND INDEX NECESSARY

For sometime Members of the House and Senate and other readers have found it impossible to read all of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The 60 RECORDS allotted daily to each Congressman for distribution reach only a small number of his constituents, and only a small percentage of that group find time to read the RECORD.

We can perform a fine educational service by distributing, say, 500 or more copies of an 8-page daily digest to 500 homes in each congressional district of this country. We would not disturb the regular detailed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let that go on as in the past.

OFFICIAL REPORTER'S STAFF TO BE INCREASED TO COVER DIGEST SERVICE

A digest can be prepared from the official transcript, or directly from the debates themselves at the time they occur. Speed would be facilitated by having the RECORD digest reporters on the floor at the time of the debates. A well-trained news reporter might qualify for such a position. If the reporter is uncertain as to the main point of any speech, he can easily determine that by communicating with the Member whose speech he is condensing. I have the assurance of those who are in a position to know, that this service can be performed for the Congress and the public without difficulty.

In past years reporters of great newspapers and news services have occupied chairs at the desk of the House and ably condensed and digested the proceedings day by day. What has been done can be done. We all have long waiting lists for RECORD requests we cannot fill. Suppose you had available tomorrow 500 more copies of a digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in addition to the regular complete RECORD quota. At once your waiting list is supplied, and you have copies to spare for distribution—this to the great benefit of the general public.

A DAILY CONGRESSIONAL RECORD INDEX

Another project worth considering is the publication of a daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD index with each publication of the RECORD. RECORDS are now indexed every 2 weeks, and I have found, from my own experience and from talking with other Members of the House that the bimonthly index is not available when we want it. It is good as far as it goes but it is not sufficient. The speeches we wish to locate must be found at once. A daily digest would give us the necessary information in each RECORD from day to day, and for more detailed information on any speech we could refer to the daily index and the complete daily RECORD.

8-PAGE DIGEST PRACTICAL

Members generally agree that the digest should not be over 8 pages. From the Printer's standpoint the condensation should be made in 4, 8, or 16 pages, so that there will be no waste of paper. It might be well to experiment with the digest, having it 8 pages at first, and longer or shorter later on should Members prefer. Any such condensation would save the busy man's time and perform an invaluable service to thousands of citizens who now have no access to the daily proceedings of Congress.

DIGEST AND INDEX PLAN FAVORED BY THE PUBLIC

The office of the Congressional Digest should be in the Capitol Building, in the office of the Official Reporters. After the digest has been completed, the manuscript is delivered to the Government Printing Office and printed the same night, simultaneously with the full RECORD. It will be delivered daily in the same manner our present daily RECORD is now delivered. Our constituents favor this plan. It will aid us in serving the people who elected us to Congress, and congressional information will be carried to a much wider circle of citizens.

I present this matter for the consideration of the Members of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, within a few weeks this session of the Seventy-fourth Congress of the United States will pass into history. At times during its life differences of opinion on policies of our National Government have been abundantly expressed in debate on the floor of this House. Few measures have received unanimous approbation. Some have been approved or disapproved by slight

majorities; others by an overwhelming vote of the membership of this body. The success or failure of its major acts will be determined only with the passage of time and, fairly or unfairly, justly or unjustly, partially or impartially, will be passed upon and judged by the American people.

The party in power will be held responsible and either lauded or condemned for its legislative accomplishments. The sins of commission can always be explained; the sins of omission have no defense. This truth applies equally to those affiliated with the majority party and those allied with the minority. While the burden of proposing constructive legislation in a Congress whose Membership is of the same political thought as that of the administration, is as a practical proposition, almost confined to the membership of that conviction, it is within the power and becomes the duty of the minority Members, if they perceive omission or neglect on the part of those in power to provide adequate enactments of law for the benefit of the public generally, to step into the breach and suggest or propose what they think is for the best interests of the Nation. Without going into the merits or demerits of its labors, when this session of the Seventy-fourth Congress adjourns, it will no doubt leave upon the statute books laws affecting agriculture, banks, labor, relief of the unemployed, national defense, war profiteering, and social security.

Up to the present time, however, it has failed to seriously consider the deplorable condition of thousands of small industries located in all parts of the 48 States, Territories, and possessions which before the depression were the lifeblood of our commercial existence. Hundreds of our factories have been forced to close because of their inability to get funds for working capital. Thousands are in need of adequate machinery and equipment. All require rehabilitation of their plants. Loans for these purposes are difficult to obtain through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and almost impossible through private capital or banks. In the administration of banks our Governments, both State and National, have gone from one extreme to the other. In 1932 our banks were suffering from frozen assets; now they are afflicted with frozen cash. To turn this cash then into the channels of business should be our concern. Idle factories cannot resume operations without the necessary capital, nor can many going concerns continue without financial help. At the present time there is a demand for goods of all kinds, but in order to create markets for them the purchasing power of the people must be increased. The outstanding factor in getting out of this depression is to put men and women back to work where the results of their labor will create wealth. Nonproductive relief is but temporary and not lasting. Relief to idle factories, encouraging them to resume operations on a productive basis will again, in my judgment, start us on our way to create the wealth necessary to provide decent living conditions and some of the luxuries in life to which every American worker is entitled.

Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency which was conducting hearings on the bill to extend the functions of that Corporation. In answer to a query as to whether there was not plenty of money in banks to loan to local industry and if they would not lend it if they thought they had a chance to get the money back, he said:

A bank might feel that a loan is good in time, but commercial banks are not supposed to loan for 3, 4, 5, or 6 years.

Being asked if he thought banks were inclined to invest available money in Federal bonds rather than industry, Mr. Jones said:

No; they would rather lend it to industry if they could get notes that would justify it, and would not be criticized by the departments supervising them, State or National, and when the borrower might pay it back in a year or two.

On April 15 of this year Secretary of Commerce Roper made public the report on small industries submitted to him by the Business Advisory and Planning Council for the Department of Commerce. After months of study of the small industries situation throughout the country the Coun-

cil submitted to the Secretary the following specific recommendations:

The Council strongly recommended an immediate study by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal Reserve Board, and Securities and Exchange Commission in cooperation with the investment bankers of the country, to the end that facilities be offered sound, small industries for the acquisition of needed capital.

After describing the needs of small industries based on surveys made on behalf of the Council by the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce the report said:

"With the continued restoration of business activity the need of small industry for intermediate and long-term capital has become increasingly urgent. There seems to be little doubt that a large number of the smaller manufacturing concerns have been able to withstand the effects of the long-drawn-out depression in part through sharp curtailment of expenditures on repairs of building and equipment and in part through the reduction of inventories of raw materials, parts, and supplies to a hand-to-mouth basis. Not only is existing equipment wearing out at a rapid rate, but it is also becoming obsolete. The necessity for buying raw materials, etc., in limited quantities prevents concerns from acquiring them at satisfactory prices. Both factors operate to increase manufacturing costs and to reduce profits.

It is clear that the capital structure of American industry as a whole has been impaired by these and other factors and the ability of the industrial concerns, in particular, to borrow from the banks for working-capital purposes has been correspondingly lowered. In this connection the committee has been greatly impressed by the fact that the bulk of the advances and commitments made by the Federal Reserve banks have been for periods of more than 1 year.

The inability of the smaller concerns to modernize their machinery and equipment explains in no small measure the continued depression in many of the capital-goods industries.

As a matter of fact, long-term financing for small industry has always been difficult. It is not simply a depression problem. Through private investment bankers it has been available only to concerns of sufficient size and standing to warrant the investment banker in bringing out an issue as small as, for instance, \$1,000,000. So it may be said this facility has been practically denied to smaller concerns. Such enterprises have been obliged to develop their capital structures gradually out of undistributed capital. They have not received the benefits of recourse to the capital markets for their long-term requirements.

Since small industry plays a very important part in the economic life of the Nation, and since its activities contribute so much to those of the larger plants, it would seem the part of wisdom to provide the smaller, sound industrial concerns with the long-term credit facilities they require. This would make for safer commercial banking as well as for cheaper and better financing for industry as a whole.

This is and should be a natural function of the investment banker acting as the channel for the safe investment of private funds in small enterprises.

At the moment this channel is blocked by the too rigid requirements of the Securities Exchange Act; by a general fear of the future on the part of investment bankers; and by the waiting attitude of the investing public.

The need exists and is of paramount importance to recovery. Mainly it is an investment need rather than a credit need. It should be filled.

Mr. Speaker, having this situation in mind and believing that small industries have been the forgotten man in the maze of legislative proposals offered for the consideration of the present Congress, I have introduced H. R. 8250, which has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The enactment of this bill will create what shall be known as the "United States Industrial Loan Insurance Corporation" with a capital stock of \$1,000,000,000 to be subscribed by the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States.

The allotment of time during which I am permitted to speak does not permit a detailed explanation of this bill, but, generally speaking, the Corporation will be authorized to guarantee to Federal Reserve banks or State or national banks—whether members of the Federal Reserve System or not—payment of the principal and interest upon notes or evidences of indebtedness held by such bank or banks and issued for industrial purposes, which may be for raw materials, finished products, products in course of production, new equipment, the construction, repair, or remodeling of industrial plants, or additional working capital for such enterprises. The paper issued by any one borrower and covered by guaranties of the Corporation will at no time exceed \$500,000, and must mature on or before the expiration of 5 years.

The powers and duties vested in or imposed upon the Corporation will be exercised by its executive officers at the direction of a board of 12 directors. These directors will be appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One will be appointed from each Federal Reserve district, and not more than seven shall be members of any one political party. None of the directors will be permitted, directly or indirectly, to engage in banking, the making of loans, or the buying and selling of mortgages, securities, or other evidences of indebtedness, nor may they actively engage in any manner in any other business, vocation, or employment during their incumbency in the office of director of the Corporation. In each Federal Reserve district there will be a technical advisory committee composed of persons who have had at least 10 years of practical industrial executive experience, appointed solely on the basis of merit and without regard to political affiliations, and whose duties will be to investigate and report on all applications for loans and the security therefor, appraise the value of industrial property, the assets, machinery, and equipment of borrowers if necessary, and advise the officers and directors of the Corporation from an impartial standpoint as to the true status of assets, plants, security, orders for goods, accounts receivable, machinery, equipment, or anything of a technical nature which would be beneficial in determining the advisability or inadvisability of guaranteeing the loans of the various applicants.

The board of directors will be required to make an annual report to the President of the United States of the operations of the Corporation and publish from time to time such additional reports of its operations as it deems advisable.

This bill further provides that payments by an industrial concern on the principal of any note or evidence of indebtedness eligible for guaranty by the United States Industrial Loan Insurance Corporation, as well as expenditures not to exceed \$500,000 out of surplus earnings for labor or materials for new construction, repairs, remodeling, or equipment of a manufacturing plant, shall be deemed allowable deductible items in determining the net income of such concern under the Revenue Act of 1932.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the enactment of legislation of this character will give hope and encouragement to employers of labor; it will release into circulation idle excess currency now resting peacefully in the vaults of our State and national banks; it will establish permanent credit facilities for small industries; it will promote sounder banking practices and establish cooperation between small banks and small industries; it will enable the latter to modernize their machinery, equipment, and buildings; it will revive the building trades; it will not only provide immediate employment for the unemployed but it will protect the industrial worker who is now employed. In short, this legislation will encourage home production and home consumption. For thousands it will mean jobs, not temporary and irregular, but permanent and lasting. It will help industrial America to help itself.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER, at the request of Mr. DRIVER, indefinitely, on account of physical disability.

To Mr. SEARS, for 1 week, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7672. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument to Grover Cleveland in Washington, D. C.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the

President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument to Grover Cleveland in Washington, D. C.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Monday, June 24, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

392. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report on rates charged for electric power in the State of Nevada, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LLOYD: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8480. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land on McNeil Island; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3435. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to give war-time rank to retired officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard of the United States", approved June 21, 1930, so as to prohibit persons who have been subsequently separated from the service under other than honorable conditions from bearing the official title and upon occasions of ceremony wearing the uniform of the highest grade held by them during their war service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DRIVER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 273. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7349; without amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8057; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8587. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8127) for the relief of Blanche I. Gray; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (S. 735) for the relief of Wiener Bank Verein; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6393) for the relief of William F. Bourland; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 8597) to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty

provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea"; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8598) to provide for the inspection and regulation of vessels engaged in the transportation of inflammable, explosive, and like dangerous cargoes in navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8599) to provide for a change in the designation of the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection, to create a Marine Casualty Investigation Board and increase efficiency in administration of the steamboat inspection laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 8600) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to make a lease for the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 8601) to provide for the enrollment of Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STUBBS: A bill (H. R. 8602) making it illegal to employ any alien while there are American citizens unemployed, who are qualified, able, and willing to work, and fixing the penalty for willful and knowing violation thereof; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H. R. 8603) to foster industry and fair competition, to promote and encourage employment, and to prevent the dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 8604) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge and causeway across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 8605) to abolish interest on loans to veterans secured by adjusted-compensation certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 8606) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees of the classified civil service, and for other purposes', approved May 22, 1920, and 'acts in amendment thereof', approved July 3, 1926, and May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GEHRMANN: A bill (H. R. 8607) providing for payment to the State of Wisconsin for its swamp lands within all Indian reservations in that State; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 8608) to require that 70 percent of the grain used in manufacture of beer sold in the District of Columbia be barley malt; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHAEFER: A bill (H. R. 8609) authorizing the county of St. Clair, in the State of Illinois, and the State of Illinois, or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point on Broadway between Florida and Mullanphy Streets in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the town of Stites, in the county of St. Clair, State of Illinois, and connecting with St. Clair Avenue Extended in said town; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 8610) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STARNES: A bill (H. R. 8616) to establish an Alien Registration Board in the Department of Labor, to ascertain the status of foreign-born persons in the United States, to safeguard the status of registered foreign-born persons in the United States who are found to be entitled to be here, to grant temporary permission to persons held subject to deportation for them to leave without expense to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8617) restricting the appointment of employees by Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, Cabinet members, Judges of the Supreme Court, Federal judges, and other Government employees in certain cases; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GASQUE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 333) to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 to authorize grants to community hospitals; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Resolution (H. Res. 271) to authorize an investigation of smuggling of aliens into the United States and a study of the land-border patrol of the Immigration Service; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 272) to authorize the study of existing laws and preparation of separate codes of laws relating to (1) immigration, (2) deportation, (3) naturalization, and (4) expatriation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) to provide an additional period of time within which to file applications for loans under the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding the gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding Old Champlain Canal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding the antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding a pension for George S. Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding the regulation of transportation in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorials of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8611) granting a pension to Henrietta V. W. Owen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 8612) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 8613) for the relief of Isham Franklin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY: A bill (H. R. 8614) for the relief of the Bolinross Chemical Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8615) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain moneys to "Funds of Federal prisoners"; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8942. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York favoring the repeal of

the charter of the North River Bridge Co. in Public Act 350, Sixty-seventh Congress, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8943. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring necessary legislation and cooperation of Public Works Administration for construction of freight tunnel between the States of New York and New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8944. Also, petition of the State of New York, urging legislation to make Columbus Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8945. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging legislation for the benefit of the milk and dairy industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8946. Also, petition of the State of New York urging passage of Rudd bill (H. R. 6); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8947. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of William H. Pretsch and others, of the city of Kingston, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against the words "devices" and "treatment" in definition of the word "drug" being included in the Copeland Federal Food and Drug Act, Senate file 5; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8948. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging allocation of funds by Secretary Ickes for slum clearance in Borough of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8949. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging enactment of legislation to humanize immigration laws for reuniting persons and families; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8950. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging legislation for the relief of George S. Ward, a citizen of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

8951. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging repeal of current taxes on sales of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8952. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring legislation to commemorate General Pulaski's birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8953. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, referring to legislation for regulation in interstate commerce by motor carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8954. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, recommending public works for the benefit of the city of Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8955. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring passage of the social-security bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8956. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging legislation to prevent lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8957. By Mr. MURDOCK: Resolution of the Utah State Federation of Labor Executive Council, urging the reestablishment of silver as full legal-tender money of the United States at its par or face value; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

8958. By Mr. TOLAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California to the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact House bill 6628, which proposes to provide remunerative employment for the blind citizens of the United States and its possessions, and urging the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives to expedite consideration favorable to said bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8959. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of California, requesting the President and the Congress to enact Senate bill 1952, which proposes to protect the unclassified postal employees people, extending to them a civil-service status; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

8960. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 5359, by Mr. FORD of California, which provides for the creation of a National Civil Academy; to the Committee on Education.

8961. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives of the United States to expedite favorable consideration of House bill 468, by Mr. RANDOLPH, which proposes the rehabilitation of employable blind citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

8962. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of the Open Hearth Lodge, No. 148, A. A. I. S. and T. W., Warren, Ohio, by their corresponding representative, Harry Cavender, urging support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8963. Also, petition of the Milk Drivers and Dairy Employees, Local Union 361, Toledo, Ohio, by their business agent, E. J. Haumesser, urging support of the graduated tax on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8964. Also, petition of Mahoning Lodge, No. 177, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, Niles, Ohio, by their secretary, R. D. Selway, urging support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8965. Also, petition of Millinery Workers Union Local, No. 44, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Agnes Willison, urging support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill, the Black 30-hour-week bill, the Guffey coal-regulation bill, and the Mead bill; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BANKHEAD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 21, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Keyes	Overton
Ashurst	Coolidge	King	Pittman
Austin	Copeland	Logan	Pope
Bachman	Costigan	Loneragan	Robinson
Bailey	Dickinson	Long	Russell
Bankhead	Dieterich	McAdoo	Schall
Barkley	Donahey	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Duffy	McGill	Sheppard
Black	Fletcher	McKellar	Shipstead
Bone	Frazier	McNary	Smith
Borah	George	Maloney	Steiwer
Brown	Gerry	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Glass	Minton	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Moore	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Murphy	Tydings
Byrd	Hale	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	Norbeck	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Norris	Walsh
Chavez	Holt	Nye	Wheeler
Clark	Johnson	O'Mahoney	White

Mr. VANDENBERG. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COTZENS] on account of illness, and ask that the announcement stand for the day.

Mr. DIETERICH. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence from the city of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and I hope this announcement may stand for the day.